arXiv:1406.1003v2 [math.RT] 26 Dec 2015

MODULO p PARABOLIC INDUCTION OF PRO-p-IWAHORI HECKE ALGEBRA

NORIYUKI ABE

Abstract. We study the structure of parabolic inductions of a pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra. In particular, we give a classification of irreducible modulo p representations of pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra in terms of supersingular representations. Since supersingular representations are classified by Ollivier and Vignéras, it completes the classification of irreducible modulo p representations.

1. Introduction

Let G be the group of F-valued points of a connected reductive group over a p-adic field F and K' its open compact subgroup. Then K'-biinvariant functions with compact support on G forms an algebra via the convolution product. We call this algebra the Hecke algebra. When we investigate the representation theory of G over a characteristic zero field, this algebra has an important role. One of the most important case is when K' is an Iwahori subgroup. In this case, the category of representations of the Hecke algebra is equivalent to a block of the category of smooth representations of G.

We are interested in the representations of G over a characteristic p field. In this setting, it is natural to consider a *pro-p-Iwahori subgroup* since any non-zero representations of G over a characteristic p field has a non-zero vector fixed by a pro-p-Iwahori subgroup. The corresponding Hecke algebra is called a *pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra* and the structure of this algebra is studied by Vignéras [Viga]. This structure theorem is used in [AHHV14] in which we gave a classification of irreducible admissible modulo p representations of G in terms of supersingular representations.

Another motivation to consider a pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra is to study Galois representations. It is conjectured by Vignéras [Vig05] and proved by Ollivier [Oll10] that there is the "numerical modulo p Langlands correspondence" between modulo p Galois representations and modulo p representations of a pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra of GL_n. It asserts that the number of n-dimensional modulo p Galois representations with a fixed determinant and the number of n-dimensional modulo p supersingular representations of a pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra of GL_n with a fixed action of the center of GL_n coincide with each other. Recently, Große-Klönne [GK] constructed a functor from the category of modulo p representations of a pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra of GL_n to the category of modulo p Galois representations which gives a realization of the numerical modulo p Langlands correspondence.

In this paper, we study the representations, especially parabolic inductions of a pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra. Our main theorem is the classification of the irreducible modulo p representations of a pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra in terms of supersingular representations. The supersingular representations are classified by Ollivier [Oll12] (split case) and Vignéras [Vigb] (general).

We state our main result. Let C be an algebraically closed field of characteristic p. Fix a pro-p-Iwahori subgroup of G and let $\mathcal{H}$ be the corresponding Hecke

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 22E50,20C08.

algebra with coefficients in C. We consider $\mathcal{H}$-modules. Here, modules always are right modules unless otherwise stated. Let P be a parabolic subgroup, M its Levi subgroup and $\mathcal{H}_M$ a pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra of M. Then for a representation σ of $\mathcal{H}_M$, the parabolic induction $I_P(\sigma)$ is defined (Definition 4.8).

The statement of the main theorem is almost the same as the group case [Abe13, AHHV14]. To state it, fix a minimal parabolic subgroup B and its Levi subgroup Z. Then we have a root system Φ and the set of simple roots Π. For $\alpha \in \Pi$, let G'_α be the group generated by the root subgroups of G corresponding to $\pm\alpha$ and put $Z'_\alpha = Z \cap G'_\alpha$. Then for a standard Levi subgroup $M \supset Z$ and a representation σ of $\mathcal{H}_M$ we define

$$\Pi(\sigma) = \{\alpha \in \Pi \mid \langle \Pi_M, \check{\alpha} \rangle = 0,\ T^M_\lambda \text{ is identity for any } \lambda \in Z'_\alpha\} \cup \Pi_M,$$

where $T^M_\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_M$ is the function supported on the double coset containing λ with respect to the pro-p-Iwahori subgroup of M (Iwahori-Matsumoto basis) and Π_M is the set of simple roots of M. Let $P(\sigma)$ be the corresponding parabolic subgroup. Now consider triples (P, σ, Q) such that

- P is a parabolic subgroup with Levi subgroup M.
- σ is a supersingular representation of M.
- Q is a parabolic subgroup such that $P \subset Q \subset P(\sigma)$.

For such a pair, we define an $\mathcal{H}$-module $I(P, \sigma, Q)$ as follows. Let $M(\sigma) \supset Z$ be the Levi subgroup of $P(\sigma)$. We can prove that there is the "extension" $e(\sigma)$ of σ to $\mathcal{H}_{M(\sigma)}$ (Proposition 4.16). Then for each $Q' \supset Q$, we have an embedding $I_{Q'}(e(\sigma)) \hookrightarrow I_Q(e(\sigma))$. Now let

$$I(P, \sigma, Q) = I_Q(e(\sigma))/\sum_{Q' \supsetneq Q} I_{Q'}(e(\sigma)).$$

Then the main theorem of this paper is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *The corresponding $(P, \sigma, Q) \mapsto I(P, \sigma, Q)$ gives a bijection between such triples and isomorphism classes of irreducible representations of $\mathcal{H}$.*

The study is based on the structure theory of pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebras studied by Vignéras [Viga]. Fix a maximal split torus in Z and denote (the group of F-valued points of) it by S. Let $I(1)$ be the pro-p-Iwahori subgroup. (It corresponds to a certain chamber in the apartment corresponding to S, see the next section for the detail.) Then Z is the centralizer of S in G. Put $\widetilde{W}(1) = N_G(S)/(Z \cap I(1))$. Then we have the Bruhat decomposition $\widetilde{W}(1) = I(1)\backslash G/I(1)$. Hence there is a basis of $\mathcal{H}$ which is indexed by $\widetilde{W}(1)$. The basis is called *Iwahori-Matsumoto basis*. Similar to the affine Hecke algebra, this basis satisfies the braid relations and quadratic relations. Like the affine Hecke algebra, we have another basis $\{E(\widetilde{w}) \mid \widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}(1)\}$, called *Bernstein basis*. Put $\Lambda(1) = Z/(Z \cap I(1)) \subset \widetilde{W}(1)$. Then $\mathcal{A} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda(1)} CE(\lambda)$ is a subalgebra. In general, $\mathcal{A}$ is not commutative. However, it is almost commutative and the study of representations of $\mathcal{A}$ is not so difficult.

The basic tactics to study the representations is via the restriction to $\mathcal{A}$. Hence it is important to know about irreducible representations of $\mathcal{A}$. An important invariant of an irreducible representation X of $\mathcal{A}$ is its support $\operatorname{supp} X$ defined by $\operatorname{supp} X = \{\lambda \in \Lambda(1) \mid XE(\lambda) \neq 0\}$. Then we can prove that it is the closure of a facet (Proposition 3.6). More precisely, the following holds. Let $X_*(S)$ be the group of cocharacters of S and set $V = X_*(S) \otimes \mathbb{R}$. Then the finite Weyl group W acts on V as a reflection group. Hence we have a notion of a facet in V. We also have a group homomorphism $\nu\colon \Lambda(1) \to V$. Let Θ be a subset of Π and put $\Lambda_\Theta(1) = \{\lambda \in \Lambda(1) \mid \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle = 0\ (\alpha \in \Theta)\}$. For $w \in W$, fix a representative

$n_w \in \widetilde{W}(1)$. Let $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)] = \bigoplus_{\tau \in \Lambda_\Theta(1)} C\tau_\lambda$ be the group algebra of $\Lambda_\Theta(1)$. Define ${}_w\chi_\Theta \colon \mathcal{A} \to C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)]$ by

$$ {}_w\chi_\Theta(E(\lambda)) = \begin{cases} \tau_{n_w^{-1}\lambda n_w} & (w^{-1}(\nu(\lambda)) \text{ is dominant and } n_w^{-1}\lambda n_w \in \Lambda_\Theta(1)), \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases} $$

Then we can prove that any irreducible representation factors through ${}_w\chi_\Theta$ for some w and Θ. For the proof of our main theorem, we study the modules ${}_w\chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$.

We study these modules in Section 3 by constructing intertwining operators. Let $s \in W$ be a simple reflection and assume that $sw > w$. Then we construct a homomorphism ${}_w\chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \to {}_{sw}\chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ (Proposition 3.2) which is always injective (Proposition 3.12). Moreover, often it is an isomorphism. In fact, if we put $\Pi_w = \{\alpha \in \Pi \mid w(\alpha) > 0\}$, then $\Pi_w = \Pi_{sw}$ implies that ${}_w\chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \to {}_{sw}\chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ is an isomorphism (Theorem 3.13). Moreover, we have ${}_{w_1}\chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \simeq {}_{w_2}\chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ if $\Pi_{w_1} = \Pi_{w_2}$. If $\Pi_w \neq \Pi_{sw}$, ${}_w\chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \to {}_{sw}\chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ is not an isomorphism. We can construct an intertwining operator ${}_{sw}\chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \to {}_w\chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ in opposite direction and calculate the compositions.

In Section 4, we give a definition and fundamental properties of parabolic inductions. One of the most important properties to prove our main theorem is the structure of a parabolic induction as an $\mathcal{A}$-module (Lemma 4.23). For example, if P is a minimal parabolic subgroup and $P(\sigma) = P$, then we can prove $I_P(\sigma)|_{\mathcal{A}} = \bigoplus_{w \in W} wX$ for some irreducible representation X of $\mathcal{A}$. In this case, using results in Section 3, we can prove that for any $w, w' \in W$, we have $wX \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \simeq w'X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$. Hence if π is a submodule of $I_P(\sigma)$ and $\pi|_{\mathcal{A}}$ contains wX for some $w \in W$, then $\pi|_{\mathcal{A}}$ contains wX for any $w \in W$. Therefore we get $\pi = I_P(\sigma)$, so $I_P(\sigma) = I(P, \sigma, P)$ is irreducible. This is a part of our main theorem. Using such arguments, we prove our main theorem in Section 4.

We have nothing about the relations between the representations of the group in this paper. We hope to address this question in a future work.

Acknowledgment. I had many discussion with Marie-France Vignéras on the structure of pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebras. I thank her for reading the manuscript and giving helpful comments. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 26707001.

2. Notation and Preliminaries

2.1. **Notation.** We will use the slightly different notation from the introduction. Our main reference is [Viga].

Let F be a non-archimedean local field, $\mathcal{O}$ its ring of integers, κ its residue field and p the characteristic of κ. Let $\boldsymbol{G}$ be a connected reductive group over F. As usual, the group of its valued points is denoted by $\boldsymbol{G}(F)$. Fix a maximal split torus $\boldsymbol{S}$ of $\boldsymbol{G}$ and a minimal parabolic subgroup $\boldsymbol{B}$ which contains $\boldsymbol{S}$. Then the centralizer $\boldsymbol{Z}$ of $\boldsymbol{S}$ in $\boldsymbol{G}$ is a Levi subgroup of $\boldsymbol{B}$. Let $\boldsymbol{U}$ be the unipotent radical of $\boldsymbol{B}$, $\overline{\boldsymbol{B}} = \boldsymbol{Z}\overline{\boldsymbol{U}}$ the opposite parabolic subgroup of $\boldsymbol{B}$. Take a special point from the apartment attached to $\boldsymbol{S}$ and let K be the special parahoric subgroup corresponding to this point. Then there is a connected reductive group $\boldsymbol{G}_\kappa$ over κ and the surjective homomorphism $K \to \boldsymbol{G}_\kappa(\kappa)$. The kernel of $K \to \boldsymbol{G}_\kappa(\kappa)$ is a pro-p group. The image of $\boldsymbol{Z}(F) \cap K$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{U}(F) \cap K$, $\overline{\boldsymbol{U}}(F) \cap K$) is the κ-valued points of an algebraic subgroup $\boldsymbol{Z}_\kappa$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{U}_\kappa$, $\overline{\boldsymbol{U}}_\kappa$) of $\boldsymbol{G}_\kappa$. Put $Z_\kappa = \boldsymbol{Z}_\kappa(\kappa)$. Let $I(1)$ be the inverse image of $\boldsymbol{U}_\kappa(\kappa)$ by $K \to \boldsymbol{G}_\kappa(\kappa)$. Then this is a *pro-p-Iwahori subgroup* of $\boldsymbol{G}(F)$. The Hecke algebra attached to $(\boldsymbol{G}(F), I(1))$ is called a *pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra*. We study the modules of this algebra over an algebraically closed filed of characteristic p. However, we will not use this algebra directly due to a technical

reason. Instead of this algebra, we use another algebra defined by generators and relations which will be introduced later. Under a suitable specialization, the algebra becomes the pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra.

The torus $\boldsymbol{S}$ gives a root datum $(X^*(\boldsymbol{S}), \Phi, X_*(\boldsymbol{S}), \check{\Phi})$ and $\boldsymbol{B}$ gives a positive system $\Phi^+ \subset \Phi$. Let $W = N_{\boldsymbol{G}(F)}(\boldsymbol{S}(F))/\boldsymbol{Z}(F)$ be the finite Weyl group and set $\widetilde{W} = N_{\boldsymbol{G}(F)}(\boldsymbol{S}(F))/(\boldsymbol{Z}(F) \cap K)$ where $N_{\boldsymbol{G}(F)}(\boldsymbol{S}(F))$ is the normalizer of $\boldsymbol{S}(F)$ in $\boldsymbol{G}(F)$. Then we have the surjective homomorphism $\widetilde{W} \to W$ and its kernel $\boldsymbol{Z}(F)/(\boldsymbol{Z}(F) \cap K)$ is denoted by Λ. Set $V = X_*(\boldsymbol{S}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$. Then V is identified with the apartment corresponding to $\boldsymbol{S}$ and $\widetilde{W}$ acts on V as an affine transformations. In particular, $\boldsymbol{Z}(F)$ acts on V as a translation. Hence we have a group homomorphism $\nu\colon \boldsymbol{Z}(F) \to V$. It is characterized by $\alpha(\nu(z)) = -\operatorname{val}(\alpha(z))$ for $\alpha \in X^*(\boldsymbol{S})$ and $z \in \boldsymbol{S}(F)$. Since ν annihilates a compact subgroup (V has no non-trivial compact subgroup), ν factors thorugh $\boldsymbol{Z}(F) \to \Lambda$. The induced homomorphism $\Lambda \to V$ is denoted by the same letter ν. Since we have a positive system Φ^+, we have the set of simple reflections $S_{\mathrm{aff}} \subset \widetilde{W}$. Let $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}$ be the group generated by S_{aff}. Then there exists a reduced root datum $\Sigma \subset V^* = \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{R}}(V, \mathbb{R})$ such that $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}$ is the group generated by the reflections with respect to $\{v \in V \mid \alpha(v) + k = 0\}$ where $\alpha \in \Sigma$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since we fixed a positive system $\Phi^+ \subset \Phi$, this determines a positive system $\Sigma^+ \subset \Sigma$. Let $\Delta \subset \Sigma^+$ be the set of simple roots. There is a natural bijection between Δ and the set of simple roots in Φ^+. (The set of simple roots in Φ^+ is denoted by Π in Section 1. We will never use Π.) More precisely, for $\alpha \in \Delta$, there exists a real number $r > 0$ such that $r\alpha$ is a simple root for Φ^+. Define the positive system Σ^+_{aff} of Σ_{aff} by $\Sigma^+_{\mathrm{aff}} = \Sigma^+ \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \cup \Sigma \times \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. For $\alpha \in \Sigma$ (resp. $\widetilde{\alpha} \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{aff}}$), let $s_\alpha \in W$ (resp. $s_{\widetilde{\alpha}} \in \widetilde{W}$) be the corresponding reflection. An element in $v \in V$ is called dominant (resp. anti-dominant) if for any $\alpha \in \Sigma^+$, $\langle v, \alpha \rangle \geq 0$ (resp. $\langle v, \alpha \rangle \leq 0$). We call v regular if $\langle v, \alpha \rangle \neq 0$ for any $\alpha \in \Sigma$.

Let $\alpha \in \Sigma$. Then there exists a unique element $\alpha' \in \Phi^{\mathrm{red}} \cap \mathbb{R}_{>0}\alpha$. The root α' gives a unipotent subgroup of $\boldsymbol{G}$ which is denoted by $\boldsymbol{U}_\alpha$. Let G'_α be the group generated by $\boldsymbol{U}_\alpha(F)$ and $\boldsymbol{U}_{-\alpha}(F)$. We also denote this group by G'_s where $s = s_\alpha$. Notice that it is not the group of F-valued points of an algebraic subgroup in general. Set $Z'_\alpha = G'_\alpha \cap \boldsymbol{Z}(F)$ and the image of Z'_α in Λ is denoted by Λ'_α. It is also denoted by Λ'_s where $s = s_\alpha$. Let $(\alpha, k) \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{aff}}$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $\alpha' = r\alpha$. Put $U_{(\alpha,k)} = U_{\alpha' + rk}$ where the notation is in [Viga, 3.5].

As usual, the length function of $\widetilde{W}$ is denoted by ℓ. It is defined by $\ell(\widetilde{w}) = \#(\Sigma^+_{\mathrm{aff}} \cap \widetilde{w}\Sigma^-_{\mathrm{aff}})$. We have the following length formula [IM65, Proposition 1.23] for $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $w \in W$:

$$\ell(\lambda w) = \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+, w^{-1}(\alpha) > 0} |\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle| + \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+, w^{-1}(\alpha) < 0} |\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle - 1|. \tag{2.1}$$

Notice that we have an embedding $W \hookrightarrow \widetilde{W}$ since we fixed a special point and $\widetilde{W} = W \ltimes \Lambda$. Put $S = S_{\mathrm{aff}} \cap W$. This is the set of simple reflections in W and (W, S) is a Coxeter system.

Put $\widetilde{W}(1) = N_{\boldsymbol{G}(F)}(\boldsymbol{S}(F))/(\boldsymbol{Z}(F) \cap I(1))$. Then we have a bijection $\widetilde{W}(1) \simeq I(1)\backslash \boldsymbol{G}(F)/I(1)$. Hence the pro-$p$-Iwahori Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{G}(F), I(1))$ has a basis parameterized by $\widetilde{W}(1)$. There is a surjective homomorphism $\widetilde{W}(1) \to \widetilde{W}$. The kernel is isomorphic to Z_κ. We will regard Z_κ as a subgroup of $\widetilde{W}(1)$. The kernel of $\widetilde{W}(1) \to W$ is $\boldsymbol{Z}(F)/(\boldsymbol{Z}(F) \cap I(1))$ and it is denoted by $\Lambda(1)$. The composition $\Lambda(1) \to \Lambda \xrightarrow{\nu} V$ is also denoted by ν. We call $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$ dominant (resp. anti-dominant, regular) if $\nu(\lambda)$ is dominant (resp. anti-dominant, regular).

For $s \in S_{\mathrm{aff}}$, let q_s be the indeterminates such that if s and s' are conjugate to each other, then $q_s = q_{s'}$. Let $\mathbb{Z}[q_s \mid s \in S_{\mathrm{aff}}/\sim]$ be the polynomial algebra

with these indeterminate here $\sim$ means the equivalence relation defined via the conjugation by $\widetilde{W}$. It will be denoted by $\mathbb{Z}[q_s]$ for short. Via a reduced expression, we extend $s \mapsto q_s$ to $\widetilde{W} \ni \widetilde{w} \to q_{\widetilde{w}} \in \prod_{s \in S_{\mathrm{aff}}/\sim} q_s^{\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$. By $\widetilde{W}(1) \to \widetilde{W}$ we have $q_{\widetilde{w}}$ for any $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}(1)$. Since $Z_\kappa \subset \widetilde{W}(1)$ is a normal subgroup, the adjoint action of $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}(1)$ gives a homomorphism $\mathbb{Z}[q_s^{1/2}][Z_\kappa] \to \mathbb{Z}[q_s^{1/2}][Z_\kappa]$. Denote this action by $c \mapsto \widetilde{w} \cdot c$. For each $\widetilde{s}$ which is a lift of $s \in S_{\mathrm{aff}}$, fix $c_{\widetilde{s}} \in \mathbb{Z}[Z_\kappa]$ such that if $\widetilde{w}\widetilde{s}\widetilde{w}^{-1} = \widetilde{s}'$ for $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}$, then $\widetilde{w} \cdot c_{\widetilde{s}} = c_{\widetilde{s}'}$ and $c_{t\widetilde{s}} = t c_{\widetilde{s}}$ for $t \in Z_\kappa$. Then Vignéras [Viga, 4.3] defined an algebra over $\mathbb{Z}[q_s]$. Under the specialization $q_s \mapsto \#(I(1)sI(1)/I(1))$ and a suitable choice of $c_{\widetilde{s}}$ (which will be explained later), this algebra becomes $\mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{G}(F), I(1))$. Let $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ be the scalar extension of this algebra to $\mathbb{Z}[q_s^{1/2}]$. This is the main object of this paper. Later, we will put $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Z}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} C$ for a field C of characteristic p. This is a $C[q_s^{1/2}]$-algebra.

As a $\mathbb{Z}[q_s^{1/2}]$-module, $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is free and has a basis indexed by $\widetilde{W}(1)$. The basis is denoted by $\{T_{\widetilde{w}}\}_{\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}(1)}$, namely we have $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Z}} = \bigoplus_{\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}(1)} \mathbb{Z}[q_s^{1/2}] T_{\widetilde{w}}$. The multiplications in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is described as follows. Define $\ell \colon \widetilde{W}(1) \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ by the composition $\widetilde{W}(1) \to \widetilde{W} \xrightarrow{\ell} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. The multiplication in $\mathcal{H}$ is defined as follows [Viga, 4.3].

- the braid relations: $T_{\widetilde{w}_1} T_{\widetilde{w}_2} = T_{\widetilde{w}_1 \widetilde{w}_2}$ if $\ell(\widetilde{w}_1) + \ell(\widetilde{w}_2) = \ell(\widetilde{w}_1 \widetilde{w}_2)$.
- the quadratic relations: $T_{\widetilde{s}}^2 = q_s T_{\widetilde{s}} + c_{\widetilde{s}} T_{\widetilde{s}}$ for $\widetilde{s} \in \widetilde{W}(1)$ which is a lift of $s \in S_{\mathrm{aff}}$.

In particular, $Z_\kappa \ni t \mapsto T_t \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ gives an embedding $\mathbb{Z}[q_s^{1/2}][Z_\kappa] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Z}}$.

It is convenient to fix a representative n_s of $s \in S_{\mathrm{aff}}$ in $\widetilde{W}(1)$ as follows. Consider the apartment attached to $\boldsymbol{S}$. Then the elements in the apartment fixed by s is a hyperplane. Take a facet $\mathcal{F}$ contained in this hyperplane whose codimension in V is one and consider the parahoric subgroup $K_{\mathcal{F}}$ attached to this facet. Then we take n_s from the group generated by $K_{\mathcal{F}} \cap \boldsymbol{U}(F)$ and $K_{\mathcal{F}} \cap \overline{\boldsymbol{U}}(F)$. Moreover, we can (and do) take n_s such that $\{n_s\}_{s \in S}$ satisfies the braid relations [Tit66]. (See also [Viga, Proposition 3.4].) Hence we define n_w for $w \in W$ via a reduced expression of w.

Let G' be the group generated by $\bigcup_{\alpha \in \Sigma} G'_\alpha$. It is also the group generated by $\boldsymbol{U}(F)$ and $\overline{\boldsymbol{U}}(F)$. Then $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}$ is the image of $N_{\boldsymbol{G}(F)}(\boldsymbol{S}(F)) \cap G'$. Let $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)$ be the image of $N_{\boldsymbol{G}(F)}(\boldsymbol{S}(F)) \cap G'$ in $\widetilde{W}(1)$. (This group is different from the group denoted by $W^{\mathrm{aff}}(1)$ in [Viga].) This is a normal subgroup of $\widetilde{W}(1)$ since G' is normal in $\boldsymbol{G}(F)$. Put $\Lambda'(1) = \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1) \cap \Lambda(1)$. This is the image of $G' \cap \boldsymbol{Z}(F)$ and it is again normal in $\widetilde{W}(1)$ since it is an intersection of normal subgroups. We introduce the Bruhat order on $\widetilde{W}(1)$ as follows. Let $\widetilde{w}_1, \widetilde{w}_2 \in \widetilde{W}(1)$ and denote its image in $\widetilde{W}$ by w_1, w_2. Then $\widetilde{w}_1 < \widetilde{w}_2$ if and only if $w_1 < w_2$ and $\widetilde{w}_1 \in \widetilde{w}_2 \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)$. Here the order in $\widetilde{W}$ is the usual Bruhat order. Assume that for $\widetilde{s} \in \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)$ which is a lift of a simple reflection, we have $c_{\widetilde{s}} \in C[Z_\kappa \cap \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)]$. (This assumption is satisfied if $c_{\widetilde{s}}$ comes from the group, see subsection 2.3.) Then we have $T_{\widetilde{w}_1} T_{\widetilde{w}_2} \in \sum_{\widetilde{v}_1 \leq \widetilde{w}_1, \widetilde{v}_2 \leq \widetilde{w}_2, \widetilde{v} \leq \widetilde{v}_1 \widetilde{v}_2} \mathbb{Z}[q_s^{1/2}] T_{\widetilde{v}}$.

Remark 2.1. In [Viga, 5.3], the order is defined as follows: let $\widetilde{w}_1, \widetilde{w}_2 \in \widetilde{W}(1)$ with the image w_1, w_2 in $\widetilde{W}$ respectively, then $\widetilde{w}_1 < \widetilde{w}_2$ if and only if $w_1 < w_2$. If $\widetilde{w}_1 < \widetilde{w}_2$ in the sense of this paper, then $\widetilde{w}_1 < \widetilde{w}_2$ in the sense of Vignéras. However the converse is not true.

2.2. **Properties of $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)$.** The subgroup $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)$ has the similar properties to $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}$. The first property is the Bruhat decomposition.

Lemma 2.2. *We have* $G'(\boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap I(1)) = \coprod_{\widetilde{w}\in\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)} I(1)\widetilde{w}I(1)$.

Proof. Put $N = N_{\boldsymbol{G}(F)}(\boldsymbol{S}(F))$. We have $\boldsymbol{G}(F) = \coprod_{\widetilde{w}\in\widetilde{W}(1)} I(1)\widetilde{w}I(1)$ [Viga, Proposition 3.35]. Let $g \in G'(\boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap I(1))$ and take $n \in N$ such that $g \in I(1)nI(1)$. We have the decomposition $I(1) = (\overline{\boldsymbol{U}}(F)\cap I(1))(\boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap I(1))(\boldsymbol{U}(F)\cap I(1))$. Since $\boldsymbol{U}(F), \overline{\boldsymbol{U}}(F) \subset G'$, $I(1)$ is contained in $G'(\boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap I(1))$. Hence we have $n \in G'(\boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap I(1))\cap N$. Since $\boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap I(1) \subset N$, we have $G'(\boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap I(1))\cap N = (G'\cap N)(\boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap I(1))$. Therefore the image of n in $\widetilde{W}(1)$ is in $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)$. □

Lemma 2.3 ([AHHV14, III.16. Proposition])**.** *For $s = s_\alpha \in S$, we have an exact sequence*

$$1 \to \Lambda'_s(1)\cap Z_\kappa \to \Lambda'_s(1) \xrightarrow{\nu} \mathbb{Z}\check{\alpha} \to 0.$$

We have the generators of $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)$.

Lemma 2.4. *The subgroup $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)$ of $\widetilde{W}(1)$ is generated by $\bigcup_{s\in S}\Lambda'_s(1)$ and $\{n_s \mid s \in S\}$.*

Proof. Let $\widetilde{W}'_s(1)$ be the subgroup of $\widetilde{W}(1)$ generated by $\Lambda'_s(1)$ and n_s. Then we have $G'_s \subset I(1)\widetilde{W}'_s(1)I(1)$ by the Bruhat decomposition of G'_s. Let $\widetilde{W}'(1)$ be the group generated by $\bigcup_{s\in S}\Lambda'_s(1)$ and $\{n_s \mid s \in S\}$. Since G' is generated by $\bigcup_{s\in S} G'_s$, we have $G' \subset I(1)\widetilde{W}'(1)I(1)$. Comparing the Bruhat decomposition of G', we get $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1) \subset \widetilde{W}'(1)$. □

Using this lemma, we get the following property on $\Lambda'(1)$.

Lemma 2.5. *The subgroup $\Lambda'(1)$ of $\Lambda(1)$ is generated by $\bigcup_{s\in S}\Lambda'_s(1)$ and $\Lambda'(1)\cap Z_\kappa$ is generated by $\bigcup_{s\in S}(\Lambda'_s(1)\cap Z_\kappa)$.*

Proof. Let $\Lambda'(1)_0$ be the subgroup generated by $\bigcup_{s\in S}\Lambda'_s(1)$. We prove that this subgroup is stable under the action of n_w for $w \in W$. It is sufficient to prove that $n_s\lambda n_s^{-1} \in \Lambda'_s(1)\lambda$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$ and $s \in S$. Let $z \in \boldsymbol{Z}(F)$ be a representative of λ. We have $n_s z n_s^{-1} z^{-1} = (n_s z n_s^{-1})z^{-1} \in \boldsymbol{Z}(F)$. Since G'_s is normalized by $\boldsymbol{Z}(F)$, we have $n_s z n_s^{-1} z^{-1} = n_s(z n_s^{-1} z^{-1}) \in G'_s$. Hence $n_s z n_s^{-1} z^{-1} \in G'_s \cap \boldsymbol{Z}(F)$. Therefore we have $n_s\lambda n_s^{-1}\lambda^{-1} \in \Lambda'_s(1)$. Hence by the above lemma, any element in $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)$ has the form $\lambda n_{s_1}\cdots n_{s_l}$ where $\lambda \in \Lambda'(1)_0$ and $s_i \in S$. Take the minimal i such that $s_1\cdots s_i < s_1\cdots s_{i-1}$. Put $w = s_1\cdots s_{i-1}$. Then $n_w = n_{ws_i}n_{s_i}$ and we have $\lambda n_{s_1}\cdots n_{s_l} = \lambda n_{ws_i}n_{s_i}^2 n_{s_{i+1}}\cdots n_{s_l} = \lambda(n_{ws_i}n_{s_i}^2 n_{ws_i}^{-1})n_{ws_i}n_{s_{i+1}}\cdots n_{s_l} \in \Lambda'(1)_0 n_{ws_i}n_{s_{i+1}}\cdots n_{s_l}$. Therefore, we can take λ and $s_1,\dots,s_l$ such that $s_1\cdots s_l$ is a reduced expression. Hence $\lambda n_{s_1}\cdots n_{s_l} = \lambda n_{s_1\cdots s_l}$. It is in $\Lambda(1)$ if and only if $s_1\cdots s_l = 1$. Therefore, $\Lambda'(1) = \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)\cap\Lambda(1)$ is $\Lambda'(1)_0$.

Let $s_1,\dots,s_n \in S$ such that $S = \{s_1,\dots,s_n\}$ where $n = \#S$. Since $\Lambda'_{s_i}(1)$ is normal in $\Lambda(1)$, we have $\Lambda'(1) = \Lambda'_{s_1}(1)\cdots\Lambda'_{s_n}(1)$. Let $\lambda \in \Lambda'(1)\cap Z_\kappa$ and take $\lambda_i \in \Lambda'_{s_i}(1)$ such that $\lambda = \lambda_1\cdots\lambda_n$. Then $0 = \nu(\lambda) = \sum_i \nu(\lambda_i)$. Take $\alpha_i \in \Delta$ such that $s_i = s_{\alpha_i}$. Then $\nu(\lambda_i) \in \mathbb{Z}\check{\alpha}_i$. Since $\{\check{\alpha}_1,\dots,\check{\alpha}_n\}$ is linearly independent, we have $\nu(\lambda_i) = 0$. Hence $\lambda_i \in \Lambda'_{s_i}(1)\cap Z_\kappa$ by Lemma 2.3. □

2.3. **Bernstein basis.** For investigating the representations of pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra, another basis, called *Bernstein basis* is important.

Let $\Delta' \subset \Sigma$ be a set of simple roots corresponding to a positive system of Σ. Vignéras [Viga] defined a $\mathbb{Z}[q_s^{1/2}]$-basis $\{E_{\Delta'}(\widetilde{w})\}_{\widetilde{w}\in\widetilde{W}(1)}$ of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Z}}$. If $c_{\widetilde{s}} \in C[Z_\kappa \cap \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)]$ for any $\widetilde{s} \in \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)$ which is a lift of a simple affine reflection, then $E_{\Delta'}(\widetilde{w}) \in T_{\widetilde{w}} + \sum_{\widetilde{v}<\widetilde{w}} \mathbb{Z}[q_s]T_{\widetilde{v}}$. (The same proof for [Viga, Corollary 5.6] is applicable.)

Remark 2.6. In fact, Vignéras defined a basis $\{E_o(\widetilde{w}) \mid \widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}(1)\}$ for any orientation o. we can attache a spherical orientation $o_{\Delta'}$ [Viga, Definition 5.16] and one can consider a basis $\{E_{o_{\Delta'}}(\widetilde{w})\}$. We put $E_{\Delta'}(\widetilde{w}) = E_{o_{\Delta'}}(\widetilde{w})$.

Here are some examples of $E_{\Delta'}(\widetilde{w})$. (See [Viga, 5.3].) For $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}(1)$, $T_{\widetilde{w}^{-1}}$ is invertible in $\mathcal{H}[q_s^{\pm 1/2}]$ and $q_{\widetilde{w}} T_{\widetilde{w}^{-1}}^{-1} \in \mathcal{H}$. We denote this element by $T^*_{\widetilde{w}}$.

Proposition 2.7. *Let Δ' be a set of simple roots.*

1. *If $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$ is dominant with respect to Δ', then $E_{\Delta'}(\lambda) = T_\lambda$.*
2. *If $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$ is anti-dominant with respect to Δ', then $E_{\Delta'}(\lambda) = T^*_\lambda$.*
3. *Let $w \in W$. We have $E_{-\Delta}(n_w) = T_{n_w}$ and $E_\Delta(n_w) = E_{w(-\Delta)}(n_w) = T^*_{n_w}$. In particular, for $s \in S$, $E_\Delta(n_s) = E_{s(-\Delta)}(n_s) = T^*_{n_s} = T_{n_s} - c_{n_s}$.*

For $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}(1)$, put $\widetilde{w}(\Delta') = w(\Delta')$ for the set of simple roots Δ' attached to a positive system where $w \in W$ is the image of $\widetilde{w}$ in W.

Proposition 2.8 ([Viga, Theorem 5.25])**.** *Let $\widetilde{w}, \widetilde{w}' \in \widetilde{W}(1)$. Then we have*

$$E_{\Delta'}(\widetilde{w}\widetilde{w}') = q_{\widetilde{w}}^{-1/2} q_{\widetilde{w}'}^{-1/2} q_{\widetilde{w}\widetilde{w}'}^{1/2} E_{\Delta'}(\widetilde{w}) E_{\widetilde{w}^{-1}(\Delta')}(\widetilde{w}').$$

In particular, if $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(1)$, then $E_{\Delta'}(\lambda_1)E_{\Delta'}(\lambda_2) = q_{\lambda_1}^{1/2} q_{\lambda_2}^{1/2} q_{\lambda_1\lambda_2}^{-1/2} E_{\Delta'}(\lambda_1\lambda_2)$. By (2.1), we have $\ell(\lambda_1\lambda_2^{-1}\lambda_1^{-1}\lambda_2) = 0$. Therefore we have $q_{\lambda_1\lambda_2^{-1}\lambda_1^{-1}\lambda_2} = 1$ and $q_{\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_1^{-1}} q_{\lambda_1\lambda_2^{-1}\lambda_1^{-1}\lambda_2} = q_{\lambda_2}$. Namely $q_{\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_1^{-1}} = q_{\lambda_2}$. Hence we get

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\Delta'}(\lambda_1)E_{\Delta'}(\lambda_2) &= q_{\lambda_1}^{1/2} q_{\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_1^{-1}}^{1/2} q_{\lambda_1\lambda_2}^{-1/2} E_{\Delta'}((\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_1^{-1})\lambda_1) \\ &= E_{\Delta'}(\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_1^{-1}) E_{\Delta'}(\lambda_1). \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

In this paper, we use $E_{-\Delta}(\widetilde{w})$ mainly. Set $E(\widetilde{w}) = E_{-\Delta}(\widetilde{w})$. Using the above properties, we have the following description of $E(\widetilde{w})$. (One can regard this description as a definition of $E(\widetilde{w})$.) Take anti-dominant $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(1)$ and $w \in W$ such that $\widetilde{w} = \lambda_1\lambda_2^{-1} n_w$. Then we have

$$E(\lambda_1\lambda_2^{-1} n_w) = q_{\lambda_1\lambda_2^{-1} n_w}^{1/2} q_{\lambda_1}^{-1/2} q_{\lambda_2}^{1/2} q_{n_w}^{-1/2} T_{\lambda_1} T_{\lambda_2}^{-1} T_{n_w}$$

Put $\theta(\lambda) = q_\lambda^{-1/2} E(\lambda) \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Z}}[q_s^{\pm 1/2}]$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$. Then for anti-dominant $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$, we have $\theta(\lambda) = q_\lambda^{-1/2} T_\lambda$ and $\theta(\lambda_1\lambda_2^{-1}) = \theta(\lambda_1)\theta(\lambda_2)^{-1}$ for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(1)$. We have

$$E(\lambda n_w) = q_{\lambda n_w}^{1/2} q_{n_w}^{-1/2} \theta(\lambda) T_{n_w}.$$

The element $\theta(\lambda)$ is denoted by $\widetilde{E}_{o_{-\Delta}}(\lambda)$ in [Viga, Lemma 5.44].

2.4. **Bernstein relations.** Let $\widetilde{\alpha} \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{aff}}$ be an affine root. Consider the apartment attached to $\boldsymbol{S}$ and take a facet $\mathcal{F}$ of codimension one in V contained in the hyperplane on which $\widetilde{\alpha}$ is null. Let $K_{\mathcal{F}}$ be the parahoric subgroup attached to $\mathcal{F}$. Then it defines a connected reductive subgroup over κ. Let $G_{\mathcal{F},\kappa}$ be the group of κ-valued points of this reductive group, $U_{\mathcal{F},\kappa}$ (resp. $\overline{U}_{\mathcal{F},\kappa}$) the image of $K_{\mathcal{F}} \cap \boldsymbol{U}(F)$ (resp. $K_{\mathcal{F}} \cap \overline{\boldsymbol{U}}(F)$). Define $Z_{\widetilde{\alpha},\kappa}$ as the intersection of Z_κ with the group generated by $U_{\mathcal{F},\kappa}$ and $\overline{U}_{\mathcal{F},\kappa}$.

Lemma 2.9. *The subgroup $Z_{\widetilde{\alpha},\kappa} \subset Z_\kappa$ does not depend on a choice of $\mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. Let $\alpha \in \Sigma$ be a root corresponding to $\widetilde{\alpha}$, $U_{\widetilde{\alpha},\kappa}$ (resp. $\overline{U}_{\widetilde{\alpha},\kappa}$) the image of $\boldsymbol{U}_\alpha(F) \cap K_{\mathcal{F}}$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{U}_{-\alpha}(F) \cap K_{\mathcal{F}}$) in $G_{\mathcal{F},\kappa}$. The root system of $G_{\mathcal{F},\kappa}$ is $\{\pm\widetilde{\alpha}\}$. Hence $Z_{\widetilde{\alpha},\kappa}$ is the intersection of Z_κ with the group generated by $U_{\widetilde{\alpha},\kappa}$ and $\overline{U}_{\widetilde{\alpha},\kappa}$. Set $r = \min\{n \in \mathbb{Z} \mid \alpha(x) + n \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{F}\}$. We have $\boldsymbol{U}_\alpha(F) \cap K_{\mathcal{F}} = U_{(\alpha,r)}$ [Viga, (45)]. Since $\alpha(x)$ only depends on $\widetilde{\alpha}$, r does not depend on a choice of $\mathcal{F}$. Hence $K_{\mathcal{F}} \cap \boldsymbol{U}_\alpha(F)$ does not depend on $\mathcal{F}$. □

For $s \in S_{\mathrm{aff}}$, take a simple affine root $\widetilde{\alpha}$ such that $s = s_{\widetilde{\alpha}}$. We take c_{n_s} coming from the Hecke algebra attached to $(G, I(1))$ [Viga, 4.2]. We have $c_{n_s} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[Z_{\widetilde{\alpha},\kappa}]$ and

$$c_{n_s} \equiv -(\#Z_{\widetilde{\alpha},\kappa})^{-1} \sum_{t \in Z_{\widetilde{\alpha},\kappa}} T_t \pmod{p}.$$

In particular, $c_{n_s} \pmod{p}$ does not depend on a choice of n_s. It satisfies $n_s \cdot c_{n_s} = c_{n_s}$.

Put $n_w(\lambda) = n_w \lambda n_w^{-1}$ for $w \in W$. The following lemma is a reformulation of the Bernstein relations of Vignéras [Viga, Theorem 5.38]. We refer this lemma as Bernstein relations in this paper.

Lemma 2.10. *Let $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$, $s = s_\alpha \in S$. There exist $\mu_{n_s}(k) \in \Lambda'_s(1)$ and $c_{n_s,k} \in \mathbb{Z}[Z_\kappa]$ such that, if $\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle \geq 0$, then*

$$\begin{aligned}\theta(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s} - T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\langle \nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle - 1} \theta(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k))c_{n_s,k} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\langle \nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle} c_{n_s,k}\theta(\mu_{n_s}(-k)\lambda).\end{aligned}$$

If $\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle < 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\theta(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s} - T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda) &= -\sum_{k=0}^{-\langle \nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle - 1} c_{n_s,-k}\theta(\mu_{n_s}(k)\lambda) \\ &= -\sum_{k=1}^{-\langle \nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle} \theta(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(-k))c_{n_s,-k}.\end{aligned}$$

These elements satisfy the following. We have $c_{n_s,k} \in \mathbb{Z}[Z_{(\alpha,k),\kappa}]$ and

$$c_{n_s,k} \equiv -(\#Z_{(\alpha,k),\kappa})^{-1} \sum_{t \in Z_{(\alpha,k),\kappa}} T_t \pmod{p}.$$

We have $\mu_{n_s}(0) = 1$, $\nu(\mu_{n_s}(k)) = k\check{\alpha}$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $n_s^{-1}(\mu_{n_s}(k)) = \mu_{n_s}(-k)$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $c_{n_s,0} = c_{n_s}$ and $\mu_{n_s}(-1)^{-1} \cdot c_{n_s,1} = c_{n_s,-1}$.

Proof. First assume that $\langle \nu(\Lambda(1)), \alpha \rangle = \mathbb{Z}$. Let $\lambda_s \in \Lambda(1)$ such that $\langle \nu(\lambda_s), \alpha \rangle = -1$. Then by [Viga, Theorem 5.38], if $n = \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle > 0$, we have

$$\theta(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s} - T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \theta(n_s(\lambda)n_s(\lambda_s)^k\lambda_s^{-k})(\lambda_s^k \cdot c_{n_s}).$$

Take $\lambda = \lambda_s^{-n}$ in this formula. Then

$$\theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^{-n})T_{n_s} - T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda_s^{-n}) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^{-n+k}\lambda_s^{-k})(\lambda_s^k \cdot c_{n_s}) \tag{2.3}$$

We have $\theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^{-n+k}\lambda_s^{-k})(\lambda_s^k \cdot c_{n_s}) = (n_s(\lambda_s)^{-n+k} \cdot c_{n_s})\theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^{-n+k}\lambda_s^{-k})$. Hence replacing k with $n-k$, we have

$$\theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^{-n})T_{n_s} - T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda_s^{-n}) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} (n_s(\lambda_s)^{-k} \cdot c_{n_s})\theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^{-k}\lambda_s^{-n+k}). \tag{2.4}$$

Since $\langle \nu(\lambda_s^n\lambda), \alpha \rangle = 0$, we have $T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda_s^n\lambda) = \theta(n_s(\lambda_s^n\lambda))T_{n_s}$ [Viga, Lemma 5.34, 5.35]. Hence multiplying by $\theta(\lambda_s^n\lambda)$ on the right, we get

$$\theta(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s} - T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} (n_s(\lambda_s)^{-k} \cdot c_{n_s})\theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^{-k}\lambda_s^k\lambda). \tag{2.5}$$

Multiply by $\theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^n)$ on the left and by $\theta(\lambda_s^n)$ on the right to (2.3) and (2.4). From (2.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda_s^n) - \theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^n)T_{n_s} &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^k\lambda_s^{-k})(\lambda_s^k \cdot c_{n_s})\theta(\lambda_s^n) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (n_s(\lambda_s)^k \cdot c_{n_s})\theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^k\lambda_s^{n-k}). \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying by $\theta(\lambda_s^{-n}\lambda)$ on the right, if $-n = \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle < 0$, then

$$T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda) - \theta(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (n_s(\lambda_s)^k \cdot c_{n_s})\theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^k\lambda_s^{-k}\lambda)$$

Similarly, from (2.4), we have

$$T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda_s^n) - \theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^n)T_{n_s} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^{n-k}\lambda_s^k)(\lambda_s^{-k} \cdot c_{n_s}).$$

and, if $-n = \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle < 0$, then

$$T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda) - \theta(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \theta(n_s(\lambda)n_s(\lambda_s)^{-k}\lambda_s^k)(\lambda_s^{-k} \cdot c_{n_s}). \tag{2.6}$$

In (2.5) and (2.6), we may replace λ_s with $n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-1}$ since $\langle \nu(n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-1}), \alpha\rangle = -1$. We get, if $n = \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle > 0$, then

$$\theta(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s} - T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} (\lambda_s^k \cdot c_{n_s})\theta(\lambda_s^k n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k}\lambda)$$

and, if $-n = \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle < 0$, then

$$T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda) - \theta(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \theta(n_s(\lambda)\lambda_s^k n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k})(n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^k \cdot c_{n_s}).$$

Now, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, put

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{n_s}(k) &= n_s(\lambda_s)^k\lambda_s^{-k}, & \mu_{n_s}(-k) &= \lambda_s^k n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k}, \\ c_{n_s,k} &= \lambda_s^k \cdot c_{n_s}, & c_{n_s,-k} &= n_s(\lambda_s)^k \cdot c_{n_s}. \end{aligned}$$

Then if $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $c_{n_s,k} \in \mathbb{Z}[\lambda_s^k \cdot Z_{(\alpha,0),\kappa}] = \mathbb{Z}[Z_{\lambda_s^k(\alpha,0),\kappa}] = \mathbb{Z}[Z_{(\alpha,k),\kappa}]$. Similarly, we have $c_{n_s,-k} \in \mathbb{Z}[Z_{(\alpha,-k),\kappa}]$. Since $n_s^2 \in Z_\kappa$ and Z_κ is commutative, $n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^k \cdot c_{n_s} = n_s^{-2} \cdot (n_s(\lambda_s)^k \cdot (n_s^2 \cdot c_{n_s})) = n_s(\lambda_s)^k \cdot c_{n_s} = c_{n_s,-k}$. Therefore these elements satisfy the Bernstein relations. To check the other conditions is easy.

Next assume that $\langle \nu(\Lambda(1)), \alpha\rangle = 2\mathbb{Z}$. Let s' be the reflection corresponding to the highest root in the component of Σ containing s, α' the highest root and $\widetilde{\alpha}' = (\alpha', 0) \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{aff}}$. Take $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}(1)$ such that $\lambda_s = n_s\widetilde{w}n_{s'}\widetilde{w}^{-1} \in \Lambda(1)$ satisfies $\ell(\lambda_s) = 2\ell(\widetilde{w}) + 2$ and $\nu(\lambda_s) = -\check{\alpha}$ [Viga, Lemma 5.15]. Put $c' = \widetilde{w} \cdot c_{n_{s'}}$. By the condition, in $\widetilde{W}$, we have $s_{\widetilde{w}(\widetilde{\alpha}')} = s\lambda_s = s_{(\alpha,-1)}$ Hence we have $\widetilde{w}(\widetilde{\alpha}') = (\alpha, -1)$.

By similar arguments using [Viga, Theorem 5.38], if $2n = \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle \geq 0$, then $\theta(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s} - T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda)$ is equal to

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \theta(n_s(\lambda))(\theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^k n_s^2 \lambda_s^{-k-1})(\lambda_s^{k+1} \cdot c') + \theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^k\lambda_s^{-k})(\lambda_s^k \cdot c_{n_s}))$$

and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} ((n_s(\lambda_s)^{-k} \cdot c')\theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^{-k}n_s^2\lambda_s^{k-1}) + (n_s(\lambda_s)^{-k} \cdot c_{n_s})\theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^{-k}\lambda_s^k))\theta(\lambda). \tag{2.7}$$

If $-2n = \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle < 0$, $T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda) - \theta(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s}$ is equal to

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}((n_s(\lambda_s)^k \cdot c')\theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^k n_s^2 \lambda_s^{-k-1}) + (n_s(\lambda_s)^k \cdot c_{n_s})\theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^k \lambda_s^{-k}))\theta(\lambda)$$

and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n}\theta(n_s(\lambda))(\theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^{-k} n_s^2 \lambda_s^{k-1})(\lambda_s^{-k+1} \cdot c') + \theta(n_s(\lambda_s)^{-k}\lambda_s^k)(\lambda_s^{-k} \cdot c_{n_s})). \tag{2.8}$$

Replace n_s with n_s^{-1} and $n_{s'}$ with $n_{s'}^{-1}$ in (2.7). Then λ_s becomes $n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-1}$, c_{n_s} becomes $c_{n_s^{-1}} = n_s^{-2}c_{n_s}$ and c' becomes $\widetilde{w} \cdot c_{n_{s'}^{-1}} = c'\widetilde{w} \cdot (n_{s'}^{-2}) = c'(\lambda_s^{-1} n_s \lambda_s^{-1} n_s)$. Hence it gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\theta(n_s^{-1}(\lambda))T_{n_s^{-1}} - T_{n_s^{-1}}\theta(\lambda) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{n}((n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k \cdot (c'\lambda_s^{-1} n_s \lambda_s^{-1} n_s))\theta(n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k n_s^{-2} n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k+1}) \\
&\quad + (n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k \cdot (n_s^{-2} c_{n_s}))\theta(n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k}))\theta(\lambda).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda_s^{-1} n_s \lambda_s^{-1} n_s = \widetilde{w} n_{s'}^{-2} \widetilde{w} \in Z_\kappa$, it commutes with n_s^{-2}. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k \cdot (c'(\lambda_s^{-1} n_s \lambda_s^{-1} n_s)))\theta(n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k n_s^{-2} n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k+1}) \\
&= (n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k \cdot c')\theta(n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k (\lambda_s^{-1} n_s \lambda_s^{-1} n_s) n_s^{-2} n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k+1}) \\
&= (n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k \cdot c')\theta(n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k n_s^{-2} (\lambda_s^{-1} n_s \lambda_s^{-1} n_s) n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k+1}) \\
&= (n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k \cdot c')\theta(n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k (n_s^{-2}\lambda_s^{-1} n_s^2)(n_s^{-1}\lambda_s^{-1} n_s) n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k+1}) \\
&= (n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k \cdot c')\theta(n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^{k-1} n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k}).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k \cdot (n_s^{-2} c_{n_s}))\theta(n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k}) \\
&= (n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k \cdot c_{n_s})\theta(n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k n_s^{-2} n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k}).
\end{aligned}$$

As in the case of $\langle \nu(\Lambda(1)), \alpha \rangle = \mathbb{Z}$, since Z_κ is commutative, we have $n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k \cdot c' = \lambda_s^k \cdot c'$ and $n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k \cdot c_{n_s} = \lambda_s^k \cdot c_{n_s}$. Therefore $\theta(n_s^{-1}(\lambda))T_{n_s^{-1}} - T_{n_s^{-1}}\theta(\lambda)$ is equal to

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n}((\lambda_s^k \cdot c')\theta(n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^{k-1} n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k}) + (\lambda_s^k \cdot c_{n_s})\theta(n_s^{-2}(\lambda_s)^k n_s^{-2} n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k}))\theta(\lambda).$$

Multiply by $T_{n_s^2}$ on the left. Since $n_s^2 \in Z_\kappa$, $T_{n_s^2}\theta(n_s^{-1}(\lambda)) = \theta(n_s^2)\theta(n_s^{-1}(\lambda)) = \theta(n_s^2 n_s^{-1}(\lambda)) = \theta(n_s(\lambda))\theta(n_s^2) = \theta(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s^2}$. We also remark that $T_{n_s^2}$ commutes with $\lambda_s^k \cdot c'$ and $\lambda_s^k \cdot c_{n_s}$ since everything is in $\mathbb{Z}[Z_\kappa]$. Hence, if $2n = \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle \geq 0$, then $\theta(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s} - T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda)$ is equal to

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n}((\lambda_s^k \cdot c')\theta(\lambda_s^{k-1} n_s^2 n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k}) + (\lambda_s^k \cdot c_{n_s})\theta(\lambda_s^k n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k}))\theta(\lambda).$$

The same argument for (2.8) implies that, if $-2n = \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle < 0$, then $T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda) - \theta(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s}$ is equal to

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n}\theta(n_s(\lambda))(\theta(\lambda_s^{k-1} n_s^2 n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k})(n_s(\lambda_s)^{k-1} \cdot c') + \theta(\lambda_s^k n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k})(n_s(\lambda_s)^k \cdot c_{n_s}).$$

Put

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_{n_s}(2k) &= n_s(\lambda_s)^k\lambda_s^{-k}, & \mu_{n_s}(2k+1) &= n_s(\lambda_s)^k n_s^2\lambda_s^{-k-1} && (k\geq 0),\\
\mu_{n_s}(-2k) &= \lambda_s^k n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k}, & \mu_{n_s}(-2k+1) &= \lambda_s^{k-1} n_s^2 n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-k} && (k\geq 1),\\
c_{n_s,2k} &= \lambda_s^k\cdot c_{n_s}, & c_{n_s,2k+1} &= \lambda_s^{k+1}\cdot c' && (k\geq 0),\\
c_{n_s,-2k} &= n_s(\lambda_s)^k\cdot c_{n_s}, & c_{n_s,-2k+1} &= n_s(\lambda_s)^{k-1}\cdot c' && (k\geq 1).
\end{aligned}$$

We have $\mu_{n_s}(-1)=n_s^2n_s^{-1}(\lambda_s)^{-1}$ and $c_{n_s,1}=\lambda_s\cdot c'$. Hence $\mu_{n_s}(-1)^{-1}\cdot c_{n_s,1}=(n_s^{-1}\lambda_s n_s^{-1}\lambda_s)\cdot c'$. We have $n_s^{-1}\lambda_s=\widetilde{w}n_{s'}\widetilde{w}^{-1}$. Hence $n_s^{-1}\lambda_s n_s^{-1}\lambda_s=\widetilde{w}n_{s'}^2\widetilde{w}^{-1}\in Z_\kappa$. Therefore $\mu_{n_s}(-1)^{-1}\cdot c_{n_s,1}=c'=c_{n_s,-1}$. It is easy to check the other conditions. □

Since n_s^{-1} is also a lift of $s\in S$ in $\widetilde{W}(1)$, we have the Bernstein relations for n_s^{-1}.

Lemma 2.11. *Put $\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(k)=\mu_{n_s}(k)n_s^{-2}$ and $c_{n_s^{-1},k}=c_{n_s,k}$. Then they satisfy the Bernstein relations for n_s^{-1}.*

Proof. Assume that $\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle>0$. Replacing λ with $n_s^{-2}(\lambda)$ in Lemma 2.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta(n_s^{-1}(\lambda))T_{n_s}-T_{n_s}\theta(n_s^{-2}(\lambda)) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle-1}\theta(n_s^{-1}(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k))c_{n_s,k}\\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle}c_{n_s,k}\theta(\mu_{n_s}(-k)n_s^{-2}(\lambda)).
\end{aligned}$$

We have $\theta(n_s^{-2}(\lambda))\theta(n_s^{-2})=\theta(n_s^{-2}\lambda)=T_{n_s^{-2}}\theta(\lambda)$. Since $n_s^{-2},c_{n_s,k}\in C[Z_\kappa]$, these commute with each other. Hence multiplying by $\theta(n_s^{-2})=T_{n_s^{-2}}$ on the right of the both sides, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta(n_s^{-1}(\lambda))T_{n_s^{-1}}-T_{n_s^{-1}}\theta(\lambda) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle-1}\theta(n_s^{-1}(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k)n_s^{-2})c_{n_s,k}\\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle}c_{n_s,k}\theta(\mu_{n_s}(-k)n_s^{-2}\lambda).
\end{aligned}$$

The same argument implies, if $\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle<0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta(n_s^{-1}(\lambda))T_{n_s^{-1}}-T_{n_s^{-1}}\theta(\lambda) &= -\sum_{k=0}^{-\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle-1}c_{n_s,-k}\theta(\mu_{n_s}(k)n_s^{-2}\lambda)\\
&= -\sum_{k=1}^{-\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle}\theta(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(-k)n_s^{-2})c_{n_s,-k}.
\end{aligned}$$

We get the lemma. □

Let C be an algebraically closed field of characteristic p and set $\mathcal{H}=\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Z}}\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}C$. This is a $C[q_s^{1/2}]$-algebra. As an element of $\mathcal{H}$, c_{n_s} and $c_{n_s,k}$ does not depend on a choice of n_s and we denote it by c_s and $c_{s,k}$. The field C is a $C[q_s^{1/2}]$-algebra via $q_s^{1/2}\mapsto 0$. Then $\mathcal{H}\otimes_{C[q_s^{1/2}]}C$ is isomorphic to the Hecke algebra for $(\boldsymbol{G}(F),I(1))$ with coefficients in C. The following lemma is useful for calculations in $\mathcal{H}\otimes_{C[q_s^{1/2}]}C$.

Lemma 2.12. *Let $\lambda,\mu\in\Lambda(1)$ and $\alpha\in\Sigma^+$ such that $\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle>0$. Assume that there exists $k\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $k\leq\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle$ and $\nu(\mu)=\nu(\lambda)-k\check{\alpha}$. Then we have $\ell(\lambda)\geq\ell(\mu)+2\min\{k,\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle-k\}$. Moreover, equality holds if and only if $k=0$ or $k=\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle$ or $w(\alpha)$ is simple for some $w\in W$ such that $n_w(\lambda)$ is dominant.*

The elements appeared in the Bernstein relations (e.g. $\lambda\mu_{n_s}(-k)$) satisfies the condition of μ in this lemma.

Proof. Since $\ell(\mu) = \ell(n_s(\mu))$ and $\nu(n_s(\mu)) = \nu(\lambda) - (\langle\nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle - k)\check{\alpha}$, replacing μ with $n_s(\mu)$ if necessary, we may assume $k \leq \langle\nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle/2$. Take $v \in W$ such that $\nu(n_v(\mu))$ is dominant. We may assume $v(\alpha) > 0$ since $\langle\nu(n_v(\mu)), v(\alpha)\rangle = \langle\nu(\mu), \alpha\rangle = \langle\nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle - 2k \geq 0$. Set $\rho = (1/2)\sum_{\beta\in\Sigma^+}\beta$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell(\mu) &= \ell(n_v(\mu)) \\
&= \sum_{\gamma\in\Sigma^+} |\langle\nu(n_v(\mu)), \gamma\rangle| \\
&= \sum_{\gamma\in\Sigma^+} \langle\nu(n_v(\mu)), \gamma\rangle \\
&= \sum_{\gamma\in\Sigma^+} \langle\nu(n_v(\lambda)), \gamma\rangle - k\sum_{\gamma\in\Sigma^+} \langle v(\check{\alpha}), \gamma\rangle \\
&\leq \sum_{\gamma\in\Sigma^+} |\langle\nu(n_v(\lambda)), \gamma\rangle| - k\sum_{\gamma\in\Sigma^+} \langle v(\check{\alpha}), \gamma\rangle \\
&= \ell(n_v(\lambda)) - 2k\langle v(\check{\alpha}), \rho\rangle \\
&= \ell(\lambda) - 2k\langle v(\check{\alpha}), \rho\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Since $v(\check{\alpha}) \in \Sigma^+$, we have $\langle v(\check{\alpha}), \rho\rangle \geq 1$. Hence we have $\ell(\mu) \leq \ell(\lambda) - 2k$.

Assume $k \neq 0$. By the above argument, if the equality holds, then $n_v(\lambda)$ is dominant and $v(\alpha)$ is simple. Conversely, assume that there exists $v \in W$ such that $n_v(\lambda)$ is dominant and $v(\alpha)$ is simple. We have $\langle\nu(n_v(\mu)), v(\alpha)\rangle = \langle\nu(\mu), \alpha\rangle = \langle\nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle - 2k \geq 0$. If $\beta \in \Delta \setminus \{v(\alpha)\}$, then $\langle\nu(n_v(\mu)), \beta\rangle = \langle\nu(n_v(\lambda)), \beta\rangle - k\langle v(\alpha), \beta\rangle \geq 0$. Hence $n_v(\mu)$ is dominant. By the above argument, the equality holds. □

One application of the above lemma and the Bernstein relations is the following "the simple Bernstein relations at $q = 0$". (See [Viga, Corollary 5.53].)

Lemma 2.13. *Let $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$, $s = s_\alpha \in S$. In $\mathcal{H} \otimes C$, we have the following. If $\langle\nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle > 0$, then*

$$E(n_s(\lambda))(T_{n_s} - c_s) = T_{n_s}E(\lambda).$$

If $\langle\nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle < 0$, then

$$E(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s} = (T_{n_s} - c_s)E(\lambda).$$

Proof. If $\langle\nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle > 0$, by the Bernstein relations,

$$E(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s} - T_{n_s}E(\lambda) = \sum_{k=0}^{\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle-1} q_\lambda^{1/2} q_{n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k)}^{-1/2} E(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k))c_{s,k}.$$

The lemma follows from the following claim in this case.

Claim. We have $q_\lambda^{1/2} q_{n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k)}^{-1/2} \in C[q_s^{1/2}]$. If $k \neq 0$, then under $C[q_s^{1/2}] \to C$, $q_\lambda^{1/2} q_{n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k)}^{-1/2}$ goes to 0.

Proof of Claim. In the above equation, the left hand side is in $\mathcal{H}$. The images of by ν of $(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k))_k$ are distinct by Lemma 2.10. Recall that $\{E(w)\}_{w\in\widetilde{W}(1)}$ is a $C[q_s^{1/2}]$-basis of $\mathcal{H}$. Therefore $q_\lambda^{1/2} q_{n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k)}^{-1/2} \in C[q_s^{1/2}]$. Hence there exists $n_s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for $s \in S_{\mathrm{aff}}/\sim$ such that $q_\lambda^{1/2} q_{n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k)}^{-1/2} \in \prod_s q_s^{n_s/2}$. We have $\sum_{s\in S_{\mathrm{aff}}/\sim} n_s = \ell(\lambda) - \ell(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k))$. By the above lemma, the right hand side is grater than or equal to $2k$. Hence if $k \neq 0$, there exists s such that $n_s > 0$. The claim follows. □

The same argument implies the lemma if $\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle < 0$. □

If $\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle = 0$, we have $T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda) = \theta(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s} \in \mathcal{H}[q_s^{\pm 1/2}]$. We have a slightly more general properties. If $k = 0$, it is [AHHV14, IV.17. Lemma].

Lemma 2.14. *Let $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $\alpha \in \Delta$, $s = s_\alpha$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Assume that $\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle = 0$. Then we have $\theta(\mu_{n_s}(-k))c_{s,-k}\theta(\lambda) = \theta(n_s(\lambda))\theta(\mu_{n_s}(-k))c_{s,-k}$ in $\mathcal{H}[q_s^{\pm 1/2}]$. In particular $c_s\theta(\lambda) = \theta(n_s(\lambda))c_s$ and hence $(T_{n_s} - c_s)E(\lambda) = E(n_s(\lambda))(T_{n_s} - c_s)$ in $\mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. Take λ_0 from the center of $\Lambda(1)$ such that $\langle \nu(\lambda_0), \alpha \rangle < -k$. Put $n = -\langle \nu(\lambda_0), \alpha \rangle$. Since $T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda) = \theta(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{l=0}^{n} \theta(n_s(\lambda_0)\mu_{n_s}(-l))c_{s,-l}\theta(\lambda) &= (T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda_0) - \theta(n_s(\lambda_0))T_{n_s})\theta(\lambda) \\
&= T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda)\theta(\lambda_0) - \theta(n_s(\lambda_0))T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda) \\
&= \theta(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda_0) - \theta(n_s(\lambda_0))\theta(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s} \\
&= \theta(n_s(\lambda))(T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda_0) - \theta(n_s(\lambda_0))T_{n_s}) \\
&= \sum_{l=0}^{n} \theta(n_s(\lambda))\theta(n_s(\lambda_0)\mu_{n_s}(-l))c_{s,-l} \\
&= \sum_{l=0}^{n} \theta(n_s(\lambda_0))\theta(n_s(\lambda))\theta(\mu_{n_s}(-l))c_{s,-l}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\sum_{l=0}^{n} \theta(\mu_{n_s}(-l))c_{s,-l}\theta(\lambda) = \sum_{l=0}^{n} \theta(n_s(\lambda))\theta(\mu_{n_s}(-l))c_{s,-l}. \tag{2.9}$$

This is an equality in $\bigoplus_{\lambda' \in \Lambda(1)} \mathbb{Z}\theta(\lambda')$. We have

$$\theta(\mu_{n_s}(-l))c_{s,-l}\theta(\lambda), \theta(n_s(\lambda))\theta(\mu_{n_s}(-l))c_{s,-l} \in \bigoplus_{\nu(\lambda') = \nu(\lambda) - l\check{\alpha}} C[q_s^{\pm 1/2}]\theta(\lambda').$$

Hence projecting the both sides of (2.9) to $\bigoplus_{\nu(\lambda') = \nu(\lambda) - k\check{\alpha}} C[q_s^{\pm 1/2}]\theta(\lambda')$, we get the first statement of the lemma. Putting $k = 0$, we have $c_s\theta(\lambda) = \theta(n_s(\lambda))c_s$. Hence the second statement follows. □

These formulas are very simple. However, it is too simple even for studying representations over C. So later we use the original Bernstein relations (Lemma 2.10). For specializing $q_s \to 0$, Lemma 2.12 and an argument in the proof of Lemma 2.13 is useful and it will be used later.

Finally, we prove the following lemma which will be used later. This lemma is discovered in the study of [AHHV14].

Lemma 2.15 ([AHHV14, IV.24. Proposition])**.** *Let $\alpha \in \Delta$ and put $s = s_\alpha$. The groups $Z_{(\alpha,0),\kappa}$ and $Z_{(\alpha,-1),\kappa}$ generates $\Lambda'_s(1) \cap Z_\kappa$. In particular, for a non-trivial character $\psi\colon \Lambda'_s(1) \cap Z_\kappa \to C^\times$ we have $\psi(c_s c_{s,-1}) = 0$.*

Proof. Replacing $\boldsymbol{G}$ with the algebraic group generated by $\boldsymbol{U}_\alpha$ and $\boldsymbol{U}_{-\alpha}$, we may assume that $\boldsymbol{G}$ has a semisimple F-rank 1. Put $s_0 = s_{(\alpha,0)}$, $s_1 = s_{(\alpha,-1)}$. Then we have $S_{\mathrm{aff}} = \{s_0, s_1\}$ and the map $s_0 \mapsto n_{s_0}$, $s_1 \mapsto n_{s_1}$ extends to the map $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}} \to G'$ such that the braid relations hold. (Since the semisimple F-rank is 1, a reduced expression of any element in $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}$ is unique.) We denote this map by $\widetilde{w} \mapsto n_{\widetilde{w}}$. Let Z_0 (resp. Z_1) be the inverse image of $Z_{(\alpha,0),\kappa}$ (resp. $Z_{(\alpha,-1),\kappa}$) in $\boldsymbol{Z}(F) \cap K$ and H_0 the group generated by Z_0 and Z_1. Put $H =$

$\bigcup_{w\in\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}} I(1)n_wH_0I(1)$. Since we have $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1) = \{n_w \mid w \in \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}\}Z_\kappa$, we have $G'(\boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap I(1)) = \bigcup_{\widetilde{w}\in\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)} I(1)\widetilde{w}I(1) = \bigcup_{w\in\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}} I(1)n_w(\boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap K\cap G')I(1) = H(\boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap K\cap G')$. By relations between the Iwahori-Matsumoto basis (braid relations and quadratic relations), $\sum_{\widetilde{w}\in H}\mathbb{C}T_{\widetilde{w}} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Z}}\otimes\mathbb{C}$ is a subalgebra where we regard $\mathbb{C}$ as a $\mathbb{Z}[q_s^{1/2}]$-algebra via $q_s^{1/2}\mapsto \#(I(1)sI(1)/I(1))^{1/2}$. By the definition of the convolution product, the coefficient of $T_{\widetilde{w}_1\widetilde{w}_2}$ in $T_{\widetilde{w}_1}T_{\widetilde{w}_2}$ is non-zero. Hence H is a subgroup.

Let $\psi\colon \boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap K\cap G'\to\mathbb{C}^\times$ be a character which is trivial on H_0. We prove ψ is trivial. It follows that $H_0 = \boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap K\cap G'$. By the Bruhat decomposition, $H\cap(\boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap K\cap G')\subset H_0$, on which ψ is trivial. Hence we can define a map $\psi'\colon G'(\boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap I(1)) = H(\boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap K\cap G')\to\mathbb{C}^\times$ by $\psi'(ht)=\psi'(t)$ for $h\in H$ and $t\in\boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap K\cap G'$.

We prove ψ' is a character. Let $h_1,h_2\in\bigcup_{w\in\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}} n_wH_0$ and $t_1,t_2\in\boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap K\cap G'$. Then t_1 normalizes $I(1)$ and h_2 normalizes $\boldsymbol{Z}(F)\cap K\cap G'$. Hence

$$I(1)h_1I(1)t_1I(1)h_2I(1)t_2 = I(1)h_1I(1)h_2I(1)(h_2^{-1}t_1h_2)t_2.$$

Since H is a subgroup, $I(1)h_1I(1)h_2I(1)\subset H$. Therefore on the above set, the value of ψ' is $\psi((h_2^{-1}t_1h_2)t_2)$. We prove $\psi(h_2^{-1}t_1h_2)=\psi(t_1)$. We may assume $h_2=n_{s_i}$ where $i=0$ or 1. We prove $t_1^{-1}h_2^{-1}t_1h_2\in Z_i$. Put $\widetilde{\alpha}=(\alpha,-i)\in\Sigma_{\mathrm{aff}}$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a facet which we used when we defined $Z_{\widetilde{\alpha},\kappa}$. Then we have a finite group $G_{\mathcal{F},\kappa}$. Let $U_{\widetilde{\alpha},\kappa}$ and $\overline{U}_{\widetilde{\alpha},\kappa}$ be as in the proof of Lemma 2.9 and let $G'_{s_i,\kappa}$ be the subgroup of $G_{\mathcal{F},\kappa}$ generated by these groups. Let t_1' (resp. h_2') be the image of t_1 (resp. h_2) in $G_{\mathcal{F},\kappa}$. Then $h_2'\in G'_{s_i,\kappa}$. Since t_1' normalizes this group, $(t_1')^{-1}(h_2')^{-1}t_1'h_2'\in G'_{s_i,\kappa}$. It is also in Z_κ. Hence $(t_1')^{-1}(h_2')^{-1}t_1'h_2'\in G'_{s_i,\kappa}\cap Z_\kappa = Z_{\widetilde{\alpha},\kappa}$. Therefore $t_1^{-1}h_2t_1h_2\in Z_i$. The map ψ' is a character.

Since any character of G' is trivial, ψ' is a trivial character. Hence ψ is trivial. □

3. Intertwining operators

3.1. **Construction of intertwining operators.** We use the notation in the previous section. In particular, C is an algebraically closed filed of characteristic p, $\mathcal{H}=\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Z}}\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}C$ and C is a $C[q_s^{1/2}]$-algebra via $q_s^{1/2}\mapsto 0$. In the rest of this paper, we investigate the representations of $\mathcal{H}\otimes C$. All modules (or representations) in this paper are *right* modules.

Remark 3.1. Since $\mathcal{H}\otimes C$ is finitely generated as a module of its center and the center is finitely generated over C [Vig14, Theorem 1.2], any irreducible $\mathcal{H}\otimes C$-module is finite-dimensional.

Let $\lambda_1,\lambda_2\in\Lambda(1)$. Then we have $E(\lambda_1)E(\lambda_2) = q_{\lambda_1\lambda_2}^{-1/2}q_{\lambda_1}^{1/2}q_{\lambda_2}^{1/2}E(\lambda_1\lambda_2)$ by Proposition 2.8. Hence $\mathcal{A}=\bigoplus_{\lambda\in\Lambda(1)}C[q_s^{1/2}]E(\lambda)$ is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{H}$. Let $\Lambda^+(1)$ be the set of dominant elements in $\Lambda(1)$ and $C[\Lambda^+(1)]=\bigoplus_{\lambda\in\Lambda^+(1)}C\tau_\lambda$ the monoid algebra of $\Lambda^+(1)$.

In $\mathcal{A}\otimes C$, $E(\lambda_1)E(\lambda_2) = q_{\lambda_1\lambda_2}^{-1/2}q_{\lambda_1}^{1/2}q_{\lambda_2}^{1/2}E(\lambda_1\lambda_2)$ is $E(\lambda_1\lambda_2)$ or 0 and it is not zero if and only if $\ell(\lambda_1\lambda_2)=\ell(\lambda_1)+\ell(\lambda_2)$. By the length formula (2.1), we have $\ell(\lambda_1\lambda_2)=\ell(\lambda_1)+\ell(\lambda_2)$ if and only if $\nu(\lambda_1),\nu(\lambda_2)$ are in the same closed chamber. Therefore we get

(3.1)
$$E(\lambda_1)E(\lambda_2) = \begin{cases} E(\lambda_1\lambda_2) & (\nu(\lambda_1) \text{ and } \nu(\lambda_2) \text{ are in the same closed chamber}),\\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases}$$

in $\mathcal{A}\otimes C$. Hence the C-linear map $\widetilde{\chi}\colon \mathcal{A}\otimes C\to C[\Lambda^+(1)]$ defined by

$$\widetilde{\chi}(E(\lambda))=\begin{cases}\tau_\lambda & (\lambda\in\Lambda^+(1)),\\ 0 & (\text{otherwise})\end{cases}$$

is an algebra homomorphism. We also consider it as $\mathcal{A}\to C[\Lambda^+(1)]$. For $w\in W$, we define $w\widetilde{\chi}\colon \mathcal{A}\to C[\Lambda^+(1)]$ by $(w\widetilde{\chi})(E(\lambda))=\widetilde{\chi}(E(n_w^{-1}(\lambda)))$. (Note that this homomorphism depends on a lift n_w of w.) We will prove that, for an irreducible representation X of $\mathcal{A}\otimes C$, the action of $\mathcal{A}\otimes C$ on X factors through $w\widetilde{\chi}$ for some $w\in W$ (Proposition 3.6). This is a motivation to consider this homomorphism. We construct intertwining operators between $\{w\widetilde{\chi}\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}\}_{w\in W}$. When $\boldsymbol{G}=\mathrm{GL}_n$, they are constructed by Ollivier [Oll10, 5D1].

Proposition 3.2. *Let $w\in W$ and $s\in S$ such that $sw>w$. Then*

$$1\otimes 1\mapsto 1\otimes T^*_{n_s}$$

gives a homomorphism $w\widetilde{\chi}\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}\to sw\widetilde{\chi}\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}$.

Proof. We prove $1\otimes(T_{n_s}-c_s)E(\lambda)=(w\widetilde{\chi})(E(\lambda))\otimes(T_{n_s}-c_s)\in sw\widetilde{\chi}\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}$ for $\lambda\in\Lambda(1)$. Take a simple root α such that $s=s_\alpha$. If $\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle=0$, then by Lemma 2.14, we have $1\otimes(T_{n_s}-c_s)E(\lambda)=1\otimes E(n_s(\lambda))(T_{n_s}-c_s)=(sw\widetilde{\chi})(E(n_s(\lambda)))\otimes(T_{n_s}-c_s)$. Since $sw>w$, we have $n_{sw}=n_sn_w$. Therefore we get $(sw\widetilde{\chi})(E(n_s(\lambda)))=\widetilde{\chi}(E(n_w^{-1}n_s^{-1}n_s(\lambda)))=\widetilde{\chi}(E(n_w^{-1}(\lambda)))=(w\widetilde{\chi})(E(\lambda))$. We get the lemma in this case.

Assume that $\langle\alpha,\nu(\lambda)\rangle>0$. Then $\langle(sw)^{-1}(\alpha),(sw)^{-1}(\nu(\lambda))\rangle>0$. Therefore $n_{sw}^{-1}(\lambda)$ is not dominant since $(sw)^{-1}(\alpha)<0$. Hence $(sw\widetilde{\chi})(E(\lambda))=0$. Therefore we have $1\otimes c_sE(\lambda)=1\otimes E(\lambda)(\lambda^{-1}\cdot c_s)=(sw\widetilde{\chi})(E(\lambda))\otimes(\lambda^{-1}\cdot c_s)=0$. In $\mathcal{H}\otimes C$, we have $E(n_s(\lambda))(T_{n_s}-c_s)=T_{n_s}E(\lambda)$ by Lemma 2.13. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}1\otimes(T_{n_s}-c_s)E(\lambda)&=1\otimes T_{n_s}E(\lambda)\\&=1\otimes E(n_s(\lambda))(T_{n_s}-c_s)\\&=(sw\widetilde{\chi})(E(n_s(\lambda)))\otimes(T_{n_s}-c_s)\\&=(w\widetilde{\chi})(E(\lambda))\otimes(T_{n_s}-c_s).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, assume that $\langle\alpha,\nu(\lambda)\rangle<0$. Then $\langle w^{-1}(\alpha),w^{-1}(\nu(\lambda))\rangle<0$. Since $w^{-1}(\alpha)>0$, $n_w^{-1}(\lambda)$ is not dominant. Hence $(w\widetilde{\chi})(E(\lambda))=0$. Therefore it is sufficient to prove that $1\otimes(T_{n_s}-c_s)E(\lambda)=0$. By Lemma 2.13, we have

$$\begin{aligned}1\otimes(T_{n_s}-c_s)E(\lambda)&=1\otimes E(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s}\\&=(sw\widetilde{\chi})(E(n_s(\lambda)))\otimes T_{n_s}\\&=(w\widetilde{\chi})(E(\lambda))\otimes T_{n_s}=0.\end{aligned}$$

□

The homomorphism obtained in the above lemma is denoted by $\Phi_{sw,w}\colon w\widetilde{\chi}\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}\to sw\widetilde{\chi}\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}$. More generally, if $\ell(w_1)=\ell(w_1w_2^{-1})+\ell(w_2)$, we have a homomorphism $\Phi_{w_1,w_2}\colon w_2\widetilde{\chi}\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}\to w_1\widetilde{\chi}\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}$ defined by $1\otimes 1\mapsto 1\otimes T^*_{n_{w_1w_2^{-1}}}$ by the above proposition and induction on $\ell(w_1w_2^{-1})$.

To construct the intertwining operator of the inverse direction, we need a notation. For $\alpha\in\Delta$, $s=s_\alpha$ and $\lambda\in\Lambda(1)$ such that $\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle>0$, define

$$d(s,\lambda)=\begin{cases}1 & (n_{w_1}(\lambda)\text{ is dominant and }w_1(\alpha)\text{ is simple for some }w_1\in W),\\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}).\end{cases}$$

Lemma 3.3. *In C, we have $d(s,\lambda)=q_\lambda^{1/2}q_s^{-1}q_{\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)}^{-1/2}$.*

Proof. By the length formula (2.1) and the assumption $\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\ell(\lambda n_s^{-1}) &= \sum_{\beta \in \Sigma^+ \setminus \{\alpha\}} |\langle \nu(\lambda), \beta \rangle| + |\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle - 1| \\ &= \sum_{\beta \in \Sigma^+ \setminus \{\alpha\}} |\langle \nu(\lambda), \beta \rangle| + |\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle| - 1 \\ &= \ell(\lambda) - 1.\end{aligned}$$

Hence $E(\lambda n_s^{-1}) = q_\lambda^{1/2} q_s^{-1} \theta(\lambda) T_{n_s^{-1}}$. By the Bernstein relation (Lemma 2.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned}E(\lambda n_s^{-1}) &= q_\lambda^{1/2} q_s^{-1} \theta(\lambda) T_{n_s^{-1}} \\ &= q_\lambda q_s^{-1} T_{n_s^{-1}} \theta(n_s(\lambda)) - \sum_{k=1}^{\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle} q_\lambda^{1/2} q_s^{-1} q_{\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-k)}^{-1/2} E(\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-k)) c_{s,-k}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have $q_\lambda^{1/2} q_s^{-1} q_{\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)}^{-1/2} \in C[q_s]$. The lemma follows from Lemma 2.12 and an argument in the proof Lemma 2.13. □

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\alpha \in \Delta$, $s = s_\alpha$ and $w \in W$ such that $sw > w$. Take λ from the center of $\Lambda(1)$ such that $w^{-1}(\lambda)$ is dominant and $\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle \geq 2$. Then*

$$1 \otimes 1 \mapsto 1 \otimes (E(\lambda n_s^{-1}) + d(s, \lambda) E(\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)) c_{s,-1})$$

gives a homomorphism $sw\widetilde{\chi} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \to w\widetilde{\chi} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$.

Proof. Put $d = d(s, \lambda)$. We have $E(\lambda n_s^{-1}) = q_\lambda^{1/2} q_s^{-1} \theta(\lambda) T_{n_s^{-1}}$ by the proof of Lemma 3.3. Let $\mu \in \Lambda(1)$. We prove

$$\begin{aligned}&1 \otimes (E(\lambda n_s^{-1}) + dE(\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)) c_{s,-1}) E(\mu) \\ &= (sw\widetilde{\chi})(E(\mu)) \otimes (E(\lambda n_s^{-1}) + dE(\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)) c_{s,-1})\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

in $w\widetilde{\chi} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$. Assume that $\langle \nu(\mu), \alpha \rangle = 0$. Since λ is in the center of $\Lambda(1)$, by Lemma 2.14, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\theta(\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)) c_{s,-1} \theta(\mu) &= \theta(\lambda) \theta(\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)) c_{s,-1} \theta(\mu) \\ &= \theta(\lambda) \theta(n_s^{-1}(\mu)) \theta(\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)) c_{s,-1} \\ &= \theta(n_s^{-1}(\mu)) \theta(\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)) c_{s,-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence $E(\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)) c_{s,-1} E(\mu) = E(n_s^{-1}(\mu)) E(\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)) c_{s,-1}$. Since $T_{n_s^{-1}} \theta(\mu) = \theta(n_s^{-1}(\mu)) T_{n_s^{-1}}$, we have

$$\theta(\lambda) T_{n_s^{-1}} \theta(\mu) = \theta(\lambda) \theta(n_s^{-1}(\mu)) T_{n_s^{-1}} = \theta(n_s^{-1}(\mu)) \theta(\lambda) T_{n_s^{-1}}.$$

Hence $E(\lambda n_s^{-1}) E(\mu) = E(n_s^{-1}(\mu)) E(\lambda n_s^{-1})$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}&(E(\lambda n_s^{-1}) + dE(\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)) c_{s,-1}) E(\mu) \\ &= E(n_s^{-1}(\mu)) (E(\lambda n_s^{-1}) + dE(\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)) c_{s,-1}).\end{aligned}$$

We get the lemma in this case.

Next assume that $\langle \nu(\mu), \alpha \rangle > 0$. Then $\langle (sw)^{-1}(\alpha), (sw)^{-1}(\nu(\mu)) \rangle > 0$. Since $(sw)^{-1}(\alpha) = -w^{-1}(\alpha) < 0$, $n_{sw}^{-1}(\mu)$ is not dominant. Hence we have $(sw\widetilde{\chi})(E(\mu)) = 0$. The right hand side of (3.2) is zero.

By the Bernstein relation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(\lambda n_s^{-1})E(\mu) &= q_\lambda^{1/2} q_\mu^{1/2} q_s^{-1} \theta(\lambda) T_{n_s^{-1}} \theta(\mu) \\ &= q_\lambda^{1/2} q_\mu^{1/2} q_s^{-1} \theta(\lambda n_s^{-1}(\mu)) T_{n_s^{-1}} \\ &\quad - \sum_{k=1}^{\langle \nu(\mu), \alpha \rangle} q_\lambda^{1/2} q_\mu^{1/2} q_s^{-1} \theta(\lambda) c_{s,k} \theta(\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-k)\mu). \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Since λ is in the center of $\Lambda(1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_\lambda^{1/2} q_\mu^{1/2} q_s^{-1} \theta(\lambda n_s^{-1}(\mu)) T_{n_s^{-1}} &= q_\lambda^{1/2} q_\mu^{1/2} q_s^{-1} \theta(n_s^{-1}(\mu)) \theta(\lambda) T_{n_s^{-1}} \\ &= E(n_s^{-1}(\mu)) E(\lambda n_s^{-1}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \otimes q_\lambda^{1/2} q_\mu^{1/2} q_s^{-1} \theta(\lambda n_s^{-1}(\mu)) T_{n_s^{-1}} &= 1 \otimes E(n_s^{-1}(\mu)) E(\lambda n_s^{-1}) \\ &= (w\widetilde{\chi})(E(n_s^{-1}(\mu))) \otimes E(\lambda n_s) \\ &= (sw\widetilde{\chi})(E(\mu)) \otimes E(\lambda n_s) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We calculate the second term of the right hand side of (3.3). We have

$$q_\lambda^{1/2} q_\mu^{1/2} q_s^{-1} \theta(\lambda) c_{s,k} \theta(\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-k)\mu) = q_\lambda^{1/2} q_\mu^{1/2} q_s^{-1} q^{-1/2}_{\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-k)\mu} c_{s,k} E(\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-k)\mu) \tag{3.5}$$

and, by the argument in the proof of Lemma 2.13, it is zero in $\mathcal{H} \otimes C$ if $\ell(\lambda) + \ell(\mu) - \ell(\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-k)\mu) - 2 > 0$. By Lemma 2.12, we have

$$\ell(\lambda) + \ell(\mu) - 2 \geq \ell(\lambda\mu) - 2 \geq \ell(\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-k)\mu) + 2\min\{k, \langle \nu(\lambda\mu), \alpha \rangle - k\} - 2. \tag{3.6}$$

Hence if $k > 1$ or $\langle \nu(\lambda\mu), \alpha \rangle - k > 1$, then (3.5) is zero in $\mathcal{H} \otimes C$. Since $k \leq \langle \nu(\mu), \alpha \rangle$, $\langle \nu(\lambda\mu), \alpha \rangle - k \geq \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle \geq 2 > 1$. Hence (3.5) is zero in $\mathcal{H} \otimes C$ if $k \neq 1$. Since $\mu_{n_s}(-1)^{-1} \cdot c_{s,1} = c_{s,-1}$, by Lemma 3.3, (3.5) is

$$\begin{aligned} q_\lambda^{1/2} q_\mu^{1/2} q_s^{-1} \theta(\lambda) c_{s,1} \theta(\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)\mu) &= q_\lambda^{1/2} q_s^{-1} q^{-1/2}_{\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)} E(\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)) c_{s,-1} E(\mu) \\ &= d E(\lambda \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)) c_{s,-1} E(\mu) \end{aligned}$$

Hence the left hand side of (3.2) is zero and we get (3.2).

Finally assume that $\langle \nu(\mu), \alpha \rangle < 0$. By the Bernstein relations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(\lambda n_s^{-1})E(\mu) &= q_\lambda^{1/2} q_s^{-1} q_\mu^{1/2} \theta(\lambda) T_{n_s^{-1}} \theta(\mu) \\ &= q_\lambda^{1/2} q_s^{-1} q_\mu^{1/2} \theta(\lambda n_s^{-1}(\mu)) T_{n_s^{-1}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{-\langle \nu(\mu), \alpha \rangle} q_\lambda^{1/2} q_s^{-1} q_\mu^{1/2} \theta(\lambda n_s^{-1}(\mu) \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-k)) c_{s,-k}. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.4),

$$q_\lambda^{1/2} q_s^{-1} q_\mu^{1/2} \theta(\lambda n_s^{-1}(\mu)) T_{n_s^{-1}} = E(n_s^{-1}(\mu)) E(\lambda n_s^{-1}).$$

The term

$$\begin{aligned} &q_\lambda^{1/2} q_s^{-1} q_\mu^{1/2} \theta(\lambda n_s^{-1}(\mu) \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-k)) c_{s,-k} \\ &= q_\lambda^{1/2} q_s^{-1} q_\mu^{1/2} q^{-1/2}_{\lambda n_s^{-1}(\mu) \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-k)} E(\lambda n_s^{-1}(\mu) \mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-k)) c_{s,-k} \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

is zero if $\ell(\lambda)+\ell(\mu)+\ell(\lambda n_s^{-1}(\mu)\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-k))-2>0$ by the argument in the proof of Lemma 2.13. We have

$$\begin{aligned}&\ell(\lambda)+\ell(\mu)+\ell(\lambda n_s^{-1}(\mu)\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-k))-2\\&=\ell(\lambda)+\ell(n_s^{-1}(\mu))+\ell(\lambda n_s^{-1}(\mu)\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-k))-2\\&\geq \ell(\lambda n_s^{-1}(\mu))+\ell(\lambda n_s^{-1}(\mu)\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-k))-2\\&\geq 2\min\{k,\langle\nu(\lambda n_s^{-1}(\mu)),\alpha\rangle-k\}-2\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 2.12. Since $k\leq-\langle\nu(\mu),\alpha\rangle=\langle\nu(n_s^{-1}(\mu)),\alpha\rangle$, we have $\langle\nu(\lambda n_s^{-1}(\mu)),\alpha\rangle-k\geq\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle>1$. Hence (3.7) is zero if $k\neq 1$. If $k=1$, then (3.7) is

$$q_\lambda^{1/2}q_s^{-1}q_{\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)}^{-1/2}E(n_s^{-1}(\mu))E(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1))c_{s,-1}=dE(n_s^{-1}(\mu))E(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1))c_{s,-1}.$$

by Lemma 3.3. Hence we get

$$E(\lambda n_s^{-1})E(\mu)=E(n_s^{-1}(\mu))(E(\lambda n_s^{-1})+dE(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1))c_{s,-1}).$$

in $\mathcal{H}\otimes C$.

On the other hand, by (2.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&1\otimes E(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1))c_{s,-1}E(\mu)\\&=1\otimes E(\mu)E(\mu^{-1}\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)\mu)(\mu^{-1}\cdot c_{s,-1})\\&=(w\widetilde{\chi})(E(\mu))\otimes E(\mu^{-1}\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)\mu)(\mu^{-1}\cdot c_{s,-1}).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\langle w^{-1}(\alpha),w^{-1}(\mu)\rangle<0$ and $w^{-1}(\alpha)>0$, $w^{-1}(\mu)$ is not dominant. Hence $w\widetilde{\chi}(E(\mu))=0$. Therefore, the left hand side of (3.2) is

$$\begin{aligned}&1\otimes E(n_s^{-1}(\mu))(E(\lambda n_s^{-1})+dE(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1))c_{s,-1})\\&=(w\widetilde{\chi})(E(n_s^{-1}(\mu)))\otimes(E(\lambda n_s^{-1})+dE(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1))c_{s,-1})\\&=(sw\widetilde{\chi})(E(\mu))\otimes(E(\lambda n_s^{-1})+dE(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1))c_{s,-1})\end{aligned}$$

We get the proposition. □

Proposition 3.5. *Let α,s,w,λ be as in Proposition 3.4. Assume that there exist λ_1,λ_2 which satisfy the same conditions for λ such that $\lambda=\lambda_1\lambda_2$. Then the compositions of homomorphisms in Proposition 3.2 and Proposition 3.4 is given by the multiplication of*

$$(w\widetilde{\chi})(E(\lambda)-d(s,\lambda)E(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1))c_{s,-1}c_s)\in C[\Lambda^+(1)].$$

Proof. Put $d=d(s,\lambda)$ and $\Phi=\Phi_{sw,w}$. Let $\Psi\colon sw\widetilde{\chi}\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}\to w\widetilde{\chi}\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}$ be the homomorphisms defined in Proposition 3.4. Then we have

$$\Psi\circ\Phi(1\otimes 1)=1\otimes(E(\lambda n_s^{-1})+dE(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1))c_{s,-1})(T_{n_s}-c_s).$$

By the proof of Lemma 3.3, we have $E(\lambda n_s^{-1})=q_\lambda^{1/2}q_s^{-1}\theta(\lambda)T_{n_s^{-1}}$. Therefore

$$E(\lambda n_s^{-1})(T_{n_s}-c_s)=q_\lambda^{1/2}q_s^{-1}\theta(\lambda)T_{n_s^{-1}}(T_{n_s}-c_s)=q_\lambda^{1/2}\theta(\lambda)=E(\lambda).$$

Since $\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle=\langle\nu(\lambda_1),\alpha\rangle+\langle\nu(\lambda_2),\alpha\rangle\geq 4$, $\langle\nu(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)),\alpha\rangle=\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle-2>0$. From this and by the length formula (2.1), we have $q_{\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)n_s}=q_{\lambda\mu_{n_s}(-1)}q_s^{-1}$. (See the proof of Lemma 3.3.) Therefore, by Proposition 2.8, we have $E(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1))T_{n_s}=q_sE(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)n_s)=0$ in $\mathcal{H}\otimes C$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi\circ\Phi(1\otimes 1)&=1\otimes(E(\lambda n_s^{-1})+dE(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1))c_{s,-1})(T_{n_s}-c_s)\\&=1\otimes(E(\lambda)-dE(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1))c_{s,-1}c_s)\\&=(w\widetilde{\chi})(E(\lambda)-dE(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1))c_{s,-1}c_s)\otimes 1.\end{aligned}$$

Next we calculate

$$\Psi\circ\Phi(1\otimes 1)=1\otimes(T_{n_s}-c_s)(E(\lambda n_s^{-1})+dE(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1))c_{s,-1}).$$

First, by the Bernstein relation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda)T_{n_s^{-1}}&=\theta(n_s(\lambda))T_{n_s}T_{n_s^{-1}}-\sum_{k=0}^{\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle-1}\theta(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k))c_{s,k}T_{n_s^{-1}}\\&=\theta(n_s(\lambda))(q_s+c_sT_{n_s^{-1}})-\sum_{k=0}^{\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle-1}\theta(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k))c_{s,k}T_{n_s^{-1}}\\&=q_s\theta(n_s(\lambda))-\sum_{k=1}^{\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle-1}\theta(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k))c_{s,k}T_{n_s^{-1}}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using (3.4) with $\mu=1$,

$$\begin{aligned}T_{n_s}E(\lambda n_s^{-1})&=q_\lambda^{1/2}q_s^{-1}T_{n_s}\theta(\lambda)T_{n_s^{-1}}\\&=E(n_s(\lambda))-\sum_{k=1}^{\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle-1}q_\lambda^{1/2}q_s^{-1}q_{n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k)}^{-1/2}E(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k))c_{s,k}T_{n_s^{-1}}.\end{aligned}$$

The term

$$q_\lambda^{1/2}q_s^{-1}q_{n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k)}^{-1/2}E(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k))c_{s,k}T_{n_s^{-1}}\tag{3.8}$$

is zero if $\ell(\lambda)-2-\ell(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k))>0$ by an argument in the proof of Lemma 2.13. Hence, by Lemma 2.12, (3.8) is zero if $k\neq 1,\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle-1$. If $k=\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle-1$, then, since $\langle\nu(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k)),\alpha\rangle>0$, we have $\ell(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k)n_s^{-1})=\ell(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k))-1$. (See the proof of Lemma 3.3.) Hence $E(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k))T_{n_s^{-1}}=q_sE(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k)n_s^{-1})$ by Proposition 2.8. Therefore, (3.8) is

$$q_\lambda^{1/2}q_{n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k)}^{-1/2}E(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k)n_s^{-1})n_s\cdot c_{s,k}.$$

It is zero since $\ell(\lambda)-\ell(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(k))>0$ by Lemma 2.12. For $k=1$, we have $q_{n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(1)}=q_{\lambda n_s^{-1}(\mu_{n_s}(1))}=q_{\lambda\mu_{n_s}(-1)}$. Hence by Lemma 3.3, we have that (3.8) is $dE(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(1))c_{s,1}T_{n_s^{-1}}$. Hence, by Lemma 2.10, 2.11, we have

$$\begin{aligned}1\otimes T_{n_s}E(\lambda n_s^{-1})&=1\otimes(E(n_s(\lambda))-dE(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(1))c_{s,1}T_{n_s^{-1}})\\&=1\otimes(E(n_s(\lambda))-dE(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s}(1))T_{n_s^{-1}}(n_s\cdot c_{s,1}))\\&=1\otimes(E(n_s(\lambda))-dE(n_s(\lambda)\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(1))T_{n_s}c_{s,-1})\\&=1\otimes(E(n_s(\lambda))-dE(n_s(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)))T_{n_s}c_{s,-1})\\&=(w\widetilde{\chi})(E(\lambda))\otimes 1-d(w\widetilde{\chi})(E(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)))\otimes T_{n_s}c_{s,-1}.\end{aligned}$$

By the length formula (2.1), we have $\ell(\lambda n_s^{-1})=\ell(\lambda_1\lambda_2n_s^{-1})=\ell(\lambda_1)+\ell(\lambda_2n_s^{-1})$. Hence $E(\lambda n_s^{-1})=E(\lambda_1)E(\lambda_2n_s^{-1})$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}1\otimes c_sE(\lambda n_s^{-1})&=1\otimes c_sE(\lambda_1)E(\lambda_2n_s^{-1})\\&=1\otimes E(\lambda_1)(\lambda_1^{-1}\cdot c_s)E(\lambda_2n_s^{-1})\\&=(sw\widetilde{\chi})(E(\lambda_1))\otimes(\lambda_1^{-1}\cdot c_s)E(\lambda_2n_s^{-1}).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\langle\alpha,\nu(\lambda_1)\rangle>0$, we have $\langle(sw)^{-1}(\alpha),(sw)^{-1}(\nu(\lambda_1))\rangle>0$. By the assumption, $(sw)^{-1}(\alpha)<0$. Hence $n_{sw}^{-1}(\lambda_1)$ is not dominant. We have $(sw\widetilde{\chi})(E(\lambda_1))=0$. Hence

$$1\otimes c_sE(\lambda n_s^{-1})=0.$$

By Proposition 3.2, we have

$$1\otimes(T_{n_s}-c_s)E(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1))c_{s,-1}=(w\widetilde{\chi})(E(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)))\otimes(T_{n_s}-c_s)c_{s,-1}.$$

From these calculations, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi\circ\Phi(1\otimes 1) &= 1\otimes(T_{n_s}-c_s)(E(\lambda n_s^{-1})+dE(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1))c_{s,-1})\\ &= (w\widetilde{\chi})(E(\lambda))\otimes 1 - d(w\widetilde{\chi})(E(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)))\otimes c_{s,-1}c_s\\ &= (w\widetilde{\chi})(E(\lambda)-dE(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1))c_{s,-1}c_s)\otimes 1.\end{aligned}$$ □

3.2. **The modules $w\chi_\Theta\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}$.** For a subset $\Theta\subset\Delta$, set $\Lambda_\Theta(1)=\{\lambda\in\Lambda(1)\mid\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle=0\ (\alpha\in\Theta)\}$ and put $\Lambda^+_\Theta(1)=\Lambda_\Theta(1)\cap\Lambda^+(1)$. Let $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)]=\bigoplus_{\lambda\in\Lambda_\Theta(1)}C\tau_\lambda$ be the group algebra. Define $\chi_\Theta\colon\mathcal{A}\to C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)]$ by

$$\chi_\Theta(E(\lambda))=\begin{cases}\tau_\lambda & (\lambda\in\Lambda^+_\Theta(1)),\\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}).\end{cases}$$

This homomorphism factors through $\widetilde{\chi}$. By (3.1), it is easy to see that this is an algebra homomorphism.

The motivation to consider χ_Θ is the following lemma. For an $\mathcal{A}\otimes C$-module X, set $\operatorname{supp}X=\{\lambda\in\Lambda(1)\mid E(\lambda)\neq 0\text{ on }X\}$. We define a new module wX by $(wX)(E(\lambda))=X(E(n_w^{-1}(\lambda)))$ on the same space. We have $\operatorname{supp}wX=n_w(\operatorname{supp}X)$.

Proposition 3.6. *Let X be an irreducible representation of $\mathcal{A}$ over C. Then it factors through $w\chi_\Theta$ for some $w\in W$ and $\Theta\subset\Delta$.*

Proof. The statement is equivalent to

- There is a closure of a facet $\mathcal{F}\subset V$ with respect to Σ such that $\nu(\operatorname{supp}X)=\nu(\Lambda(1))\cap\mathcal{F}$.
- If $\lambda\in\operatorname{supp}X$, then $E(\lambda)$ is invertible on X.

Since $E(\mu)$ is invertible for any element in $\mu\in\operatorname{Ker}\nu$, we have $\nu(\lambda)\in\nu(\operatorname{supp}X)$ if and only if $\lambda\in\operatorname{supp}X$.

First we prove that $\nu(\operatorname{supp}X)$ is a subset of a closed Weyl chamber. Take $\lambda\in\operatorname{supp}X$ and set $\mathcal{Y}=\{\mu\in\Lambda(1)\mid\nu(\mu)\text{ is in the same closed chamber of }\nu(\lambda)\}$. Then $XE(\lambda)\neq 0$. Hence $XE(\lambda)\mathcal{A}=X$. If $\mu\notin\mathcal{Y}$, $E(\lambda)E(\mu)=0$ and if $\mu\in\mathcal{Y}$ then $E(\lambda)E(\mu)=E(\lambda\mu)$ by (3.1). Hence $X=\sum_{\mu\in\mathcal{Y}}XE(\lambda)E(\mu)=\sum_{\mu\in\mathcal{Y}}XE(\lambda\mu)$. Let $\lambda'\in\Lambda(1)$ such that $\lambda'\notin\mathcal{Y}$. Then $E(\lambda\mu)E(\lambda')=0$ for $\mu\in\mathcal{Y}$. Hence $XE(\lambda')=\sum_{\mu\in\mathcal{Y}}XE(\lambda\mu)E(\lambda')=0$. Therefore $\lambda'\notin\operatorname{supp}X$. Hence $\nu(\operatorname{supp}X)$ is contained in a closed chamber.

Hence there exists $w\in W$ such that $\operatorname{supp}X\subset n_w^{-1}(\Lambda^+(1))$. Replacing X with wX, we may assume that $\operatorname{supp}X\subset\Lambda^+(1)$. For each $\alpha\in\Delta$, take λ_α from the center of $\Lambda(1)$ which satisfies $\langle\nu(\lambda_\alpha),\beta\rangle=0$ for $\beta\in\Delta\setminus\{\alpha\}$ and $\langle\nu(\lambda_\alpha),\alpha\rangle>0$. Set $\Theta=\{\alpha\in\Delta\mid\lambda_\alpha\notin\operatorname{supp}X\}$. We prove $\operatorname{supp}X=\Lambda^+_\Theta(1)$.

Take $\lambda\in\Lambda^+(1)$. There exists $n,n_\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $\langle\Delta,\nu(\lambda^n\prod_{\alpha\in\Delta}\lambda_\alpha^{-n_\alpha})\rangle=0$. Put $\mu=\lambda^n\prod_{\alpha\in\Delta}\lambda_\alpha^{-n_\alpha}$. Then $E(\mu)$ is invertible and we have $E(\lambda)^n=E(\mu)\prod_{\alpha\in\Delta}E(\lambda_\alpha)^{n_\alpha}$. If $\lambda\notin\Lambda^+_\Theta(1)$, namely $\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle\neq 0$ for some $\alpha\in\Theta$, then $n_\alpha\neq 0$ for such $\alpha\in\Theta$. Hence $E(\lambda)^n=0$ on X since $E(\lambda_\alpha)=0$ on X for $\alpha\in\Theta$. Hence $\{x\in X\mid xE(\lambda)=0\}$ is not zero. Take $x\in X$ such that $xE(\lambda)=0$. Let $\mu\in\Lambda(1)$. Then $xE(\mu)E(\lambda)=xE(\lambda)E(\lambda^{-1}\mu\lambda)=0$ by (2.2). Hence $\{x\in X\mid xE(\lambda)=0\}$ is $\mathcal{A}$-stable and by the irreducibility of X, it is equal to X. Therefore, $E(\lambda)=0$ on X. Hence $\operatorname{supp}X\subset\Lambda^+_\Theta(1)$.

If $\lambda\in\Lambda^+_\Theta(1)$ then $n_\alpha=0$ for $\alpha\in\Theta$. If $\alpha\notin\Theta$, then $E(\lambda_\alpha)$ is non-zero. Since λ_α is in the center of $\Lambda(1)$, $E(\lambda_\alpha)$ is in the center of $\mathcal{A}$. Hence $E(\lambda_\alpha)$ is scalar on X. In particular, for $\alpha\notin\Theta$, $E(\lambda_\alpha)$ is invertible. Since $E(\lambda)^n=E(\mu)\prod_{\alpha\notin\Theta}E(\lambda_\alpha)^{n_\alpha}$, $E(\lambda)$ is invertible on X. □

By the above lemma, $\operatorname{supp}X=n_w(\Lambda^+_\Theta(1))$ for some $w\in W$ and $\Theta\subset\Delta$. Let W_Θ be the group generated by $\{s_\alpha\mid\alpha\in\Theta\}$. Then for $w\in W_\Theta$, $n_w(\Lambda^+_\Theta(1))=\Lambda^+_\Theta(1)$.

Since the multiplication $\{w \in W \mid w(\Theta) \subset \Sigma^+\} \times W_\Theta \to W$ is bijective, we can take the above w such that $w(\Theta) \subset \Sigma^+$. We have $\operatorname{supp} X = n_w(\Lambda^+_\Theta(1))$ if and only if the action of $\mathcal{A}$ on X factors through $w\chi_\Theta$.

Remark 3.7. For an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-module X, we can attache $\Theta \subset \Lambda(1)$, $w \in W/W_\Theta$ and an irreducible module X_0 of $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)]$ such that $X = X_0 \circ w\chi_\Theta$. On the other hand, if (Θ, w, X_0) is given, then we get $X = X_0 \circ w\chi_\Theta$. Hence irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-modules are classified by such triples.

The $\mathcal{H}$-module $w\chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ has the right action of $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)]$. Hence it is a $(C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)], \mathcal{H})$-bimodule. The first property of $w\chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ is the following freeness as a $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)]$-module.

Proposition 3.8. *The module $w\chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ is free of finite rank as a $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)]$-module.*

We use the following easy lemma.

Lemma 3.9. *Let X be a $C[\Lambda^+_\Theta(1)]$-module. Assume that X has a decomposition $X = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_\Theta(1)} X_\lambda$ such that $\dim X_\lambda \leq 1$ and $\tau_\mu(X_\lambda) \subset X_{\mu\lambda}$. Then the module $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)] \otimes_{C[\Lambda^+_\Theta(1)]} X$ is free of rank less than or equal to one.*

Proof. Notice that $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)]$ is the ring of fractions of $C[\Lambda^+_\Theta(1)]$ with respect to $\{\tau_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda^+_\Theta(1)\}$. We may assume $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)] \otimes X_\lambda \neq 0$ for some $\lambda \in \Lambda_\Theta(1)$, since if there is no such λ, then $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)] \otimes_{C[\Lambda^+_\Theta(1)]} X = 0$. Then $\tau_\mu(X_\lambda) \neq 0$ for any $\mu \in \Lambda^+_\Theta(1)$. Since $\dim X_\lambda, \dim X_{\mu\lambda} \leq 1$, τ_μ gives an isomorphism $X_\lambda \to X_{\mu\lambda}$. Hence a homomorphism $C[\Lambda^+_\Theta(1)] \to X$ defined by $f \mapsto fm$ is injective for $m \in X_\lambda \setminus \{0\}$. Fix $m \in X_\lambda \setminus \{0\}$ and consider the homomorphism $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)] \to C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)] \otimes_{C[\Lambda^+_\Theta(1)]} X$ induced by the above homomorphism (namely $f \mapsto f \otimes m$).

We prove that it is an isomorphism. It is injective since the above homomorphism is injective and $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)]$ is a ring of fractions. Take $\lambda' \in \Lambda_\Theta(1)$ such that $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)] \otimes X_{\lambda'} \neq 0$. Take $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \Lambda^+_\Theta(1)$ such that $\mu_1\lambda = \mu_2\lambda'$. Then we have $\tau_{\mu_1}(X_\lambda) = X_{\mu_1\lambda} = \tau_{\mu_2}(X_{\lambda'})$. Hence $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)] \otimes X_{\lambda'} = C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)]\tau_{\mu_2}^{-1}\tau_{\mu_1} \otimes X_\lambda = C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)] \otimes X_\lambda$. Since $X = \bigoplus_{\lambda' \in \Lambda_\Theta(1)} X_{\lambda'}$, we have $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)] \otimes X = \sum_{\lambda' \in \Lambda_\Theta(1)} C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)] \otimes X_{\lambda'}$. Hence the homomorphism is surjective. □

Proof of Proposition 3.8. Notice that the image of $w\chi_\Theta$ is $C[\Lambda^+_\Theta(1)]$ and the kernel of $w\chi_\Theta$ is $\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda(1) \setminus n_w(\Lambda^+_\Theta(1))} CE(\lambda)$. Hence

$$w\chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} = C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)] \otimes_{C[\Lambda^+_\Theta(1)]} \left((\mathcal{H} \otimes C) / \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda(1) \setminus n_w(\Lambda^+_\Theta(1))} CE(\lambda)\mathcal{H} \right) \right).$$

For $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$ and $v \in W$, put

$$\sigma_{\lambda,v} = CE(n_w(\lambda)n_v) / \left(\sum_{\mu \in \Lambda(1) \setminus n_w(\Lambda^+_\Theta(1))} CE(\mu)E(\mu^{-1}n_w(\lambda)n_v) \right).$$

Then $\dim \sigma_{\lambda,v} \leq 1$. Since $E(\lambda)E(\mu n_v) \in CE(\lambda\mu n_v)$ for $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda(1)$ and $v \in W$, we have

$$(\mathcal{H} \otimes C) / \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda(1) \setminus n_w(\Lambda^+_\Theta(1))} CE(\lambda)\mathcal{H} \right) = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda(1), v \in W} \sigma_{\lambda,v}.$$

Moreover, for $\mu \in \Lambda^+_\Theta(1)$, $\tau_\mu(\sigma_\lambda) \subset \sigma_{\mu\lambda}$. We have

$$w\chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_\Theta(1) \setminus \Lambda(1), v \in W} C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)] \otimes_{C[\Lambda^+_\Theta(1)]} \bigoplus_{\mu \in \Lambda_\Theta(1)} \sigma_{\mu\lambda,v}.$$

Applying the above lemma to $\bigoplus_{\mu\in\Lambda_\Theta(1)}\sigma_{\mu\lambda,v}$, we get the freeness. Since $\mathcal{H}$ is finitely generated as a left module over $\mathcal{A}$, $w\chi_\Theta\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}$ is finitely generated as a $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)]$-module. Hence the rank is finite. □

Next, we prove the injectivity of the intertwining operator obtained in Proposition 3.2. We remark the following easy lemma.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $\alpha\in\Delta$ and $\lambda\in\Lambda_\Theta(1)$. An element in $\tau_\lambda+\sum_{\langle\nu(\mu),\alpha\rangle<\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle}C\tau_\mu$ is not a zero-divisor in $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)]$.*

Proof. Let E be such element and $F=\sum_{\mu\in\Lambda_\Theta(1)}c_\mu\tau_\mu\in C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)]$. Assume that $F\neq 0$ and put $l=\max\{\langle\nu(\mu),\alpha\rangle\mid c_\mu\neq 0\}$. Then $EF\in\sum_{\langle\nu(\mu),\alpha\rangle=l}c_\mu\tau_{\lambda\mu}+\sum_{\langle\nu(\mu),\alpha\rangle<\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle+l}C\tau_\mu$. Hence $EF\neq 0$. □

We apply this lemma to the term appearing in Proposition 3.5. So if we can take a suitable λ, then it is proved that the intertwining operator obtained in Proposition 3.2 is injective. To take λ, we use the following lemma.

Lemma 3.11. *Let $w\in W$ and $\alpha\in\Delta$ such that $s_\alpha w>w$. If $s_\alpha w(\Theta)\subset\Sigma^+$, then $w^{-1}(\alpha)\notin\mathbb{Z}\Theta$.*

Proof. By the condition, $w^{-1}(\alpha)>0$. If $w^{-1}(\alpha)\in\mathbb{Z}\Theta$, then $w^{-1}(\alpha)\in\mathbb{Z}\Theta\cap\Sigma^+$. Hence $-\alpha=s_\alpha w(w^{-1}(\alpha))\in s_\alpha w(\mathbb{Z}\Theta\cap\Sigma^+)\subset\Sigma^+$. This is a contradiction. □

Proposition 3.12. *Let $w\in W$ and $s\in S$ such that $sw(\Theta)\subset\Sigma^+$. Then the homomorphism $\Phi_{sw,w}\colon w\chi_\Theta\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}\to sw\chi_\Theta\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}$ obtained in Proposition 3.2 is injective.*

Proof. Take $\alpha\in\Delta$ such that $s=s_\alpha$. By the above lemma, $w^{-1}(\alpha)\notin\mathbb{Z}\Theta$. Hence we can take λ_1 from the center of $\Lambda(1)$ such that $n_w^{-1}(\lambda_1)\in\Lambda_\Theta^+(1)$ and $\langle w^{-1}(\alpha),\nu(n_w^{-1}(\lambda_1))\rangle\geq 2$. Then $\lambda=\lambda_1^2$ satisfies the condition of Proposition 3.4 and 3.5. Hence we have a homomorphism $sw\chi_\Theta\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}\to w\chi_\Theta\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}$ and the composition with $\Phi_{sw,w}$ is given in Proposition 3.5. By Proposition 3.8 and Lemma 3.10, the composition is injective. Hence $\Phi_{sw,w}$ is injective. □

For $w\in W$, put $\Delta_w=\{\alpha\in\Delta\mid w(\alpha)>0\}$. For $\Theta'\subset\Delta$, let $w_{\Theta'}$ be the longest element in $W_{\Theta'}$. Notice that $\Delta_{w_\Delta w_{\Theta'}}=\Theta'$. We have $\Theta\subset\Delta_w$ if and only if $w(\Theta)\subset\Sigma^+$. We prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.13. *Let $w,w'\in W$. Assume that $\Delta_w=\Delta_{w'}$ and $\Theta\subset\Delta_w$. Then $w\chi_\Theta\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}\simeq w'\chi_\Theta\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}$.*

We need lemmas to prove the theorem.

Lemma 3.14. *Let $w\in W$ and $\lambda\in\Lambda$ such that for any $\alpha\in\Sigma^+$, if $w(\alpha)<0$, then $\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle>0$. Then we have $T_{n_w}^{-1}E(n_w(\lambda))\in\mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. We have $T_{n_w}^{-1}=q_{n_w}^{-1}T^*_{n_w^{-1}}=q_{n_w}^{-1}E_{w(-\Delta)}(n_w^{-1})$. Hence $T_{n_w}^{-1}E(n_w(\lambda))=q_{n_w}^{-1/2}q_{n_w(\lambda)}^{1/2}q_{\lambda n_w^{-1}}^{-1/2}E_{w(-\Delta)}(\lambda n_w^{-1})$ by Proposition 2.8. By (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\ell(\lambda n_w^{-1})&=\sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+,w(\alpha)>0}|\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle|+\sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+,w(\alpha)<0}|\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle-1|\\&=\sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+,w(\alpha)>0}|\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle|+\sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+,w(\alpha)<0}(|\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle|-1)\\&=\ell(\lambda)-\ell(w).\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have $q_{n_w(\lambda)}=q_\lambda=q_{\lambda n_w^{-1}}q_{n_w}$. Therefore we get $T_{n_w}^{-1}E(n_w(\lambda))=E_{w(-\Delta)}(\lambda n_w^{-1})\in\mathcal{H}$. □

Lemma 3.15 ([Oll10, Lemma 5.17, Lemma 5.18])**.** *Let $w \in W$ such that $w \neq w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}$. Then there exists $\alpha \in \Delta$ such that $s_\alpha w > w$, $w^{-1}(\alpha)$ is not a simple root and $\Delta_w = \Delta_{s_\alpha w}$.*

Proof. There exists $\alpha \in \Delta$ such that $s_\alpha w w_{\Delta_w}^{-1} > w w_{\Delta_w}^{-1}$. If $s_\alpha w < w$, then $w^{-1}(\alpha) < 0$. Since $w_{\Delta_w} w^{-1}(\alpha) > 0$, $w^{-1}(\alpha) \in \Sigma^- \cap \mathbb{Z}\Delta_w$. Hence $\alpha \in w(\Sigma^- \cap \mathbb{Z}\Delta_w) \subset \Sigma^-$, this is a contradiction. Therefore $s_\alpha w > w$. If $w^{-1}(\alpha)$ is a simple root, then $w^{-1}(\alpha) \in \Delta_w$. Hence $w_{\Delta_w} w^{-1}(\alpha) < 0$. This is a contradiction. Hence $w^{-1}(\alpha)$ is not a simple root. Therefore, for any $\beta \in \Delta$, $w(\beta) \neq \pm\alpha$. Hence we have $w(\beta) > 0$ if and only if $s_\alpha w(\beta) > 0$. Therefore $\Delta_w = \Delta_{s_\alpha w}$. □

Remark 3.16. From this lemma, $w_\Delta w_{\Theta'}$ is the maximal element in $\{w \in W \mid \Delta_w = \Theta'\}$. If $\Theta'' \supset \Theta$, then $w_\Delta w_{\Theta''} < w_\Delta w_{\Theta'}$. Hence $w_\Delta w_{\Theta'}$ is also the maximal element in $\{w \in W \mid \Delta_w \supset \Theta'\}$.

Proof of Theorem 3.13. We may assume $w' = w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}$. By Lemma 3.15, there exists $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l$ such that

- $s_{\alpha_i} \cdots s_{\alpha_l} w > s_{\alpha_{i+1}} \cdots s_{\alpha_l} w$.
- $(s_{\alpha_{i+1}} \cdots s_{\alpha_l} w)^{-1}(\alpha_i)$ is not simple.
- $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w} = s_{\alpha_1} \cdots s_{\alpha_l} w$.

Set $s_i = s_{\alpha_i}$. By Proposition 3.2, we have the homomorphism $\Phi_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}, w} \colon w\chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \to w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w} \chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ defined by $\Phi_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}, w}(1 \otimes 1) = 1 \otimes T^*_{n_{s_1 \cdots s_l}}$. This is injective by Proposition 3.12. We prove that $\Phi_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}, w}$ is surjective.

Claim. We have $1 \otimes T^*_{n_{s_1 \cdots s_{l-1}}} T_{n_w} = 0$ in $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w} \chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$.

It is sufficient to prove that $\Phi_{w_\Delta, w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}}(1 \otimes T^*_{n_{s_1 \cdots s_{l-1}}} T_{n_w}) = 0$ by Proposition 3.12. Put $s = s_l$. Then $\Phi_{w_\Delta, w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}}(1 \otimes T^*_{n_{s_1 \cdots s_{l-1}}} T_{n_w}) = 1 \otimes T^*_{n_{w_\Delta w^{-1} s}} T_{n_w}$. We have $T^*_{n_{w_\Delta w^{-1} s}} = E_{w_\Delta w^{-1} s(-\Delta)}(n_{w_\Delta w^{-1} s})$ and $T_{n_w} = E_{-\Delta}(n_w)$. Therefore we have $T^*_{n_{w_\Delta w^{-1} s}} T_{n_w} = q^{1/2}_{n_{w_\Delta w^{-1} s}} q^{1/2}_{n_w} q^{-1/2}_{n_{w_\Delta w^{-1} s w}} E_{w^{-1} s(-\Delta)}(n_{w_\Delta w^{-1} s} n_w)$. It is sufficient to prove that $\ell(w_\Delta w^{-1} s) + \ell(w) > \ell(w_\Delta w^{-1} s w)$. Since the positive root $w^{-1}(\alpha_l)$ is not simple, $\ell(s_{w^{-1}(\alpha_l)}) > 1$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell(w_\Delta w^{-1} s w) &= \ell(w_\Delta s_{w^{-1}(\alpha_l)}) \\
&= \ell(w_\Delta) - \ell(s_{w^{-1}(\alpha_l)}) \\
&< \ell(w_\Delta) - 1 \\
&= (\ell(w_\Delta w^{-1}) - 1) + \ell(w) \\
&= \ell(w_\Delta w^{-1} s) + \ell(w).
\end{aligned}$$

We get the claim.

By the claim, $1 \otimes T^*_{n_{s_1 \cdots s_{l-1}}} c_{n_{s_l}} T_{n_w} = 1 \otimes T^*_{n_{s_1 \cdots s_{l-1}}} T_{n_w}(n_w^{-1} \cdot c_{n_{s_l}}) = 0$. Notice that $s_l w > w$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
1 \otimes T^*_{n_{s_1 \cdots s_l}} T_{n_w} &= 1 \otimes T^*_{n_{s_1 \cdots s_{l-1}}} (T_{n_{s_l}} - c_{n_{s_l}}) T_{n_w} \\
&= 1 \otimes T^*_{n_{s_1 \cdots s_{l-1}}} T_{n_{s_l w}} - 1 \otimes T^*_{n_{s_1 \cdots s_{l-1}}} c_{n_{s_l}} T_w \\
&= 1 \otimes T^*_{n_{s_1 \cdots s_{l-1}}} T_{n_{s_l w}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By induction on l, we get

$$1 \otimes T^*_{n_{s_1 \cdots s_l}} T_{n_w} = 1 \otimes T_{n_{s_1 \cdots s_l w}} = 1 \otimes T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}}}.$$

Hence $1 \otimes T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}}} \in \operatorname{Im} \Phi_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}, w}$.

Let $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$ such that $\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle = 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta_w$ and $\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle > 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta \setminus \Delta_w$. Since $\Theta \subset \Delta_w$, we have $\lambda \in \Lambda^+_\Theta(1)$. Hence $\chi_\Theta(E(\lambda)) = \tau_\lambda$ is

invertible. Assume that $\alpha \in \Sigma^+$ satisfies $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}(\alpha) < 0$. Then $\alpha \in \Sigma^+ \setminus \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Delta_w$. Therefore $\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle > 0$. Hence λ satisfies the condition of Lemma 3.14. Therefore $T^{-1}_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}}} E(n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}}(\lambda)) \in \mathcal{H}$. Hence

$$\tau_\lambda^{-1} \otimes T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}}} T^{-1}_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}}} E(n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}}(\lambda)) = \tau_\lambda^{-1} \otimes E(n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}}(\lambda)) = 1 \otimes 1$$

is in $\operatorname{Im} \Phi_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}, w}$. Since $1 \otimes 1$ generates $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w} \chi_\Theta \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$, $\Phi_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}, w}$ is surjective. □

Corollary 3.17. *Let $\Theta \subset \Delta$ be a subset and X an irreducible $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)]$-module. We regard X as an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-module via χ_Θ. Set*

$$\Delta(X) = \{\alpha \in \Delta \mid \langle \Theta, \check{\alpha} \rangle = 0,\ \tau_\lambda \in C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)] \text{ is identity on } X \text{ for } \lambda \in \Lambda'_{s_\alpha}(1)\} \cup \Theta.$$

Assume that $w, w' \in W$ satisfies $\Delta_w \cap \Delta(X) = \Delta_{w'} \cap \Delta(X)$. Then $wX \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \simeq w'X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$.

Proof. First notice that if $\alpha \in \Delta$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda'_{s_\alpha}(1)$, then $\nu(\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}\check{\alpha}$. Hence if $\langle \Theta, \check{\alpha} \rangle = 0$, $\langle \Theta, \nu(\lambda) \rangle = 0$. Therefore $\lambda \in \Lambda_\Theta(1)$. Hence $\Lambda'_{s_\alpha}(1) \subset \Lambda_\Theta(1)$. So the definition makes sense.

We may assume that there exists $\alpha \in \Delta_w$ such that $\Delta_w = \Delta_{w'} \amalg \{\alpha\}$. By Theorem 3.13, we may assume $w = w_\Delta w_{\Delta_w}$ and $w' = w s_\alpha$. Put $s = s_\alpha$, $\alpha' = w(\alpha) \in \Delta$ and $s' = s_{\alpha'}$. By the assumption, we have $\alpha \notin \Theta$. Hence we can take a dominant $\lambda_1 \in \Lambda_\Theta(1)$ from the center of $\Lambda(1)$ such that $\langle \nu(\lambda_1), \alpha \rangle \geq 2$. Put $\lambda = \lambda_1^2$. Then $n_w(\lambda)$ satisfies the conditions of Proposition 3.5 for w and s'. Hence we have a homomorphism $s'w\widetilde{\chi} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \to w\widetilde{\chi} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ and $w\widetilde{\chi} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \to s'w\widetilde{\chi} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$. These homomorphisms induce $s'wX \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \to wX \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ and $wX \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \to s'wX \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$, respectively. The compositions are induced by $X \ni x \mapsto x\chi_\Theta(E(\lambda) - E(\lambda\mu_{n_s}(-1))c_s c_{s,-1}) \in X$. Let $\varphi\colon X \to X$ be this homomorphism. We prove that it is an isomorphism.

By the condition, $\alpha \notin \Delta(X)$. Hence $\langle \Theta, \check{\alpha} \rangle \neq 0$ or $\{\tau_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda'_s(1)\}$ is not trivial on X. If $\langle \Theta, \check{\alpha} \rangle \neq 0$, then $\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1) \notin \Lambda_\Theta(1)$. Hence $\chi_\Theta(E(\lambda\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1))) = 0$. Therefore $\varphi(x) = x\chi_\Theta(E(\lambda)) = x\tau_\lambda$ on X, which is invertible.

Assume that $\langle \Theta, \check{\alpha} \rangle = 0$. Then $\lambda\mu_{n_s}(-1) \in \Lambda^+_\Theta(1)$. We have $\varphi(x) = x\tau_\lambda(1 - \tau_{\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)} c_s c_{s,-1})$, here we regard $C[Z_\kappa]$ as a subalgebra of $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)]$.

Assume that there exists $t \in \Lambda'_s(1) \cap Z_\kappa$ such that τ_t is not identity on X. Namely, $Y = \{x \in X \mid x\tau_t = x \text{ for any } t \in \Lambda'_s(1) \cap Z_\kappa\} \neq X$. Since $\Lambda'_s(1) \cap Z_\kappa \subset \Lambda(1)$ is a normal subgroup, the subspace Y is $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)]$-stable. Hence, by the irreducibility of X, $Y = 0$. Since $\#(\Lambda'_s(1) \cap Z_\kappa)$ is prime to p, we have a decomposition $X = \bigoplus_{\chi_\kappa} X_{\chi_\kappa}$ where χ_κ runs characters of $\Lambda'_s(1) \cap Z_\kappa$. Then the trivial character does not appear in X. Therefore, by Lemma 2.15, $c_s c_{s,-1}$ is zero on X. Hence $\tau_\lambda - \tau_{\lambda\mu_{n_s}(-1)} c_s c_{s,-1} = \tau_\lambda$ on X, which is invertible.

Finally, assume that $\langle \Theta, \check{\alpha} \rangle = 0$ and $E(t)$ for $t \in \Lambda'_s(1) \cap Z_\kappa$ acts trivially on X. Then $c_s = c_{s,-1} = -1$ on X. Hence $\varphi(x) = x\tau_\lambda(1 - \tau_{\mu_{n_s}(-1)})$. Since the group $\Lambda'_s(1)$ is generated by $\Lambda'_s(1) \cap Z_\kappa$ and $\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)$, $\tau_{\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)}$ is not identity. Hence $\tau_\lambda(1 - \tau_{\mu_{n_s^{-1}}(-1)}) \neq 0$ on X. Since φ is an homomorphism between irreducible modules, it is an isomorphism. □

4. Classification theorem

4.1. **pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra of a Levi subgroup.** Let $\boldsymbol{M}$ be a Levi subgroup of a standard parabolic subgroup $\boldsymbol{P}$ such that $\boldsymbol{Z} \subset \boldsymbol{M}$. There is a pro-$p$-Iwahori Hecke algebra for $\boldsymbol{M}$. This is an algebra over $C[q_{\boldsymbol{M},s}^{1/2}]$ and under the specialization $q_{\boldsymbol{M},s} \mapsto 0$, $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ is isomorphic to the pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra of $\boldsymbol{M}$ with the pro-p-Iwahori subgroup $I_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1) = I(1) \cap \boldsymbol{M}(F)$. Later we will construct

an algebra homomorphism $C[q_{\boldsymbol{M},s}^{1/2}] \to C[q_s^{1/2}]$ and we denote the base change of the pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra of $\boldsymbol{M}$ to $C[q_s^{1/2}]$ by $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Its Iwahori-Matsumoto basis is denoted by $T_{\widetilde{w}}^{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and the Bernstein basis is denoted by $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w})$. The objects for $\boldsymbol{M}$ is denoted with the suffix '$\boldsymbol{M}$'. The finite Weyl group of $\boldsymbol{M}$ is denoted by $W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$, etc. We also write '$\boldsymbol{P}$' instead of $\boldsymbol{M}$, $W_{\boldsymbol{P}} = W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$, etc.

As in [Oll10, 2C4], an element $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$ is called $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive (resp. $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative) if $\widetilde{w}((\Sigma^+ \setminus \Sigma_M^+) \times \{0\}) \subset \Sigma_{\mathrm{aff}}^+$ (resp. $\widetilde{w}^{-1}((\Sigma^+ \setminus \Sigma_M^+) \times \{0\}) \subset \Sigma_{\mathrm{aff}}^+$). It is easy to check that, for $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$ and $w \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$, $\lambda n_w \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive (resp. $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative) if and only if $\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle \leq 0$ (resp. $\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle \geq 0$) for any $\alpha \in \Sigma^+ \setminus \Sigma_{\boldsymbol{M}}^+$. In particular, for $w_1, w_2 \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and $\widetilde{w} \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$, $\widetilde{w}$ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive (resp. $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative) if and only if $n_{w_1}\widetilde{w}n_{w_2}$ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive (resp. $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative). The product of $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive (resp. $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative) elements is $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive (resp. $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative).

Lemma 4.1. *If $\widetilde{w} \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive (resp. $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative) and $\widetilde{v} \leq \widetilde{w}$ in $\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$, then $\widetilde{v}$ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive (resp. $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative).*

Proof. If $\widetilde{w} \in \Lambda(1)$, then it is [Oll12, Fact ii]. In general, let $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$ and $w \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ such that $\widetilde{w} = \lambda n_w$. We prove the lemma by induction on $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}}(w)$. Let $s \in S_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ such that $ws < w$. Then $\widetilde{v} \leq \lambda n_w$ implies $\widetilde{v}$ or $\widetilde{v}n_s$ is less than or equal to λn_{ws}. Hence $\widetilde{v}$ or $\widetilde{v}n_s$ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive. Therefore $\widetilde{v}$ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive. Since we have $\widetilde{v} \leq \widetilde{w}$ if and only if $\widetilde{v}^{-1} \leq \widetilde{w}^{-1}$, if $\widetilde{w} \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative, then $\widetilde{v}$ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative. □

Assume that an algebra homomorphism $C[q_{\boldsymbol{M},s}^{1/2}] \to C[q_s^{1/2}]$ is given. Let $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}^+$ (resp. $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}^-$) be the sub $C[q_s^{1/2}]$-module of $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ spanned by $\{T_{\widetilde{w}}^{\boldsymbol{M}}\}$ where $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive (resp. $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative). By the above lemma, $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}^{\pm}$ is a subalgebra.

Lemma 4.2. *For any set of simple roots Δ',*

$$\{E_{\Delta'}^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w}) \mid \widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1) \text{ is } \boldsymbol{M}\text{-positive (resp. } \boldsymbol{M}\text{-negative)}\}.$$

is a basis of $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}^+$ (resp. $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}^-$).

Proof. Since $E_{\Delta'}^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w}) \in T_{\widetilde{w}}^{\boldsymbol{M}} + \sum_{\widetilde{v} < \widetilde{w}} C[q_s^{1/2}] T_{\widetilde{v}}^{\boldsymbol{M}}$, this follows from Lemma 4.1. □

We have the Bernstein basis $\{E(\widetilde{w}) \mid \widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}(1)\}$. We need another basis $\{E_-(\widetilde{w}) \mid \widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}(1)\}$ defined by

$$E_-(n_w\lambda) = q_{n_w\lambda}^{1/2} q_{n_w}^{-1/2} T_{n_w}^* \theta(\lambda)$$

for $w \in W$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$.

Recall that we have an anti-involution ι of $\mathcal{H}$ defined by $T_{\widetilde{w}} \mapsto T_{\widetilde{w}^{-1}}$. To see that this is an anti-involution, we need to check that the braid relations and quadratic relations are preserved by ι. For the braid relations, let $w_1, w_2 \in \widetilde{W}(1)$ such that $\ell(w_1 w_2) = \ell(w_1) + \ell(w_2)$. Then we have $\ell((w_1 w_2)^{-1}) = \ell(w_2^{-1}) + \ell(w_1^{-1})$. Hence $T_{(w_1 w_2)^{-1}} = T_{w_2^{-1}} T_{w_1^{-1}}$. Namely the braid relations are preserved by ι. For the quadratic relations, we have $T_{n_s^{-1}}^2 = q_s T_{n_s^{-1}} + T_{n_s^{-1} c_s}$ by the quadratic relation for n_s^{-1} and $c_s T_{n_s^{-1}} = T_{n_s^{-1}} c_s$ [Viga, Remark 4.9 (b)]. This means that ι preserves the quadratic relations.

Lemma 4.3. *$E_-(\widetilde{w}) = \iota(E_\Delta(\widetilde{w}^{-1}))$ for $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}(1)$. In particular, $\{E_-(\widetilde{w}) \mid \widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}(1)\}$ is a $C[q_s^{1/2}]$-basis of $\mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$ and take anti-dominant $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(1)$ such that $\lambda = \lambda_2 \lambda_1^{-1}$. Then we have

$$E_\Delta(\lambda^{-1}) = E_\Delta(\lambda_1 \lambda_2^{-1}) = q_{\lambda_1}^{-1/2} q_{\lambda_2}^{-1/2} q_\lambda^{1/2} E_\Delta(\lambda_1) E_\Delta(\lambda_2^{-1})$$

by Proposition 2.8. By Proposition 2.7, we have $E_\Delta(\lambda_1) = T^*_{\lambda_1} = q_{\lambda_1} T^{-1}_{\lambda_1^{-1}}$ and $E_\Delta(\lambda_2^{-1}) = T_{\lambda_2^{-1}}$. Hence we get

$$E_\Delta(\lambda^{-1}) = q_{\lambda_1}^{1/2} q_{\lambda_2}^{-1/2} q_\lambda^{1/2} T^{-1}_{\lambda_1^{-1}} T_{\lambda_2^{-1}}.$$

Therefore

$$\iota(E_\Delta(\lambda^{-1})) = q_{\lambda_1}^{1/2} q_{\lambda_2}^{-1/2} q_\lambda^{1/2} T_{\lambda_2} T^{-1}_{\lambda_1}.$$

By the definition of $\theta(\lambda)$ and Proposition 2.7, we have $T_{\lambda_2} = q_{\lambda_2}^{1/2}\theta(\lambda_2)$ and $T_{\lambda_1} = q_{\lambda_1}^{1/2}\theta(\lambda_1)$. Hence

$$\iota(E_\Delta(\lambda^{-1})) = q_\lambda^{1/2}\theta(\lambda_2)\theta(\lambda_1)^{-1} = q_\lambda^{1/2}\theta(\lambda_2\lambda_1^{-1}) = q_\lambda^{1/2}\theta(\lambda).$$

Now let $w \in W$. Then we have $E_\Delta(\lambda^{-1} n_w^{-1}) = q_\lambda^{-1/2} q_w^{-1/2} q_{n_w\lambda}^{1/2} E_\Delta(\lambda^{-1}) E_\Delta(n_w^{-1})$ (Proposition 2.8). We have $E_\Delta(n_w^{-1}) = T^*_{n_w^{-1}} = q_{n_w} T^{-1}_{n_w}$ by Proposition 2.7. Hence $\iota(E_\Delta(n_w^{-1})) = q_{n_w} T^{-1}_{n_w^{-1}} = T^*_{n_w}$. Therefore we get

$$\begin{aligned}\iota(E_\Delta((n_w\lambda)^{-1})) &= q_\lambda^{-1/2} q_{n_w}^{-1/2} q_{n_w\lambda}^{1/2} \iota(E_\Delta(n_w^{-1}))\iota(E_\Delta(\lambda^{-1})) \\ &= q_{n_w}^{-1/2} q_{n_w\lambda}^{1/2} T^*_{n_w}\theta(\lambda) = E_-(n_w\lambda). \qquad \square\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\{E_-(\widetilde{w}) \mid \widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}(1)\}$ is a $C[q_s^{1/2}]$-basis of $\mathcal{H}$. We have $E_\Delta(\widetilde{w}^{-1}) \in T_{\widetilde{w}^{-1}} + \sum_{\widetilde{v}<\widetilde{w}} C[q_s^{1/2}] T_{\widetilde{v}^{-1}}$. Applying ι, we get

$$E_-(\widetilde{w}) \in T_{\widetilde{w}} + \sum_{\widetilde{v}<\widetilde{w}} C[q_s^{1/2}] T_{\widetilde{v}} = E(\widetilde{w}) + \sum_{\widetilde{v}<\widetilde{w}} C[q_s^{1/2}] E(\widetilde{v}).$$

By the definition, for $w \in W$ and $\lambda, \lambda_1 \in \Lambda(1)$, we have

$$E_-(n_w\lambda)E(\lambda_1) = q_{n_w\lambda}^{1/2} q_{\lambda_1}^{1/2} q_{n_w\lambda\lambda_1}^{-1/2} E_-(n_w\lambda\lambda_1).$$

In particular, in $\mathcal{H} \otimes C$, we get

$$E_-(n_w\lambda)E(\lambda_1) = \begin{cases} E_-(n_w\lambda\lambda_1) & (\ell(n_w\lambda) + \ell(\lambda_1) = \ell(n_w\lambda\lambda_1)), \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

We want to construct an embedding $\mathcal{H}^{\pm}_{\boldsymbol{M}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}$. To do this, we have to relate $\{q_s \mid s \in S_{\mathrm{aff}}/\sim\}$ with $\{q_{\boldsymbol{M},s} \mid s \in S_{\boldsymbol{M},\mathrm{aff}}/\sim\}$. For $\widetilde{\alpha} \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{aff}}$, take a simple affine root $\widetilde{\beta} \in \widetilde{W}\widetilde{\alpha}$ from the $\widetilde{W}$-orbit through $\widetilde{\alpha}$ and put $q(\widetilde{\alpha}) = q_{s_{\widetilde{\beta}}}$. Then it does not depend on $\widetilde{\beta}$. For a finite subset $A \subset \Sigma_{\mathrm{aff}}$, put $q(A) = \prod_{\widetilde{\alpha}\in A} q(\widetilde{\alpha})$. By induction on $\ell(\widetilde{w})$, we have $q_{\widetilde{w}} = q(\Sigma^+_{\mathrm{aff}} \cap \widetilde{w}(\Sigma^-_{\mathrm{aff}}))$. Now we define a homomorphism $C[q^{1/2}_{\boldsymbol{M},s}] \to C[q_s^{1/2}]$ by $q_{\boldsymbol{M},\widetilde{w}} \mapsto q(\Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M},\mathrm{aff}} \cap \widetilde{w}(\Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{M},\mathrm{aff}}))$ for $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$. The motivation of this definition is the following.

Lemma 4.4. *Under the specialization $q_s \mapsto \#(I(1)sI(1)/I(1))$, we have $q_{\boldsymbol{M},\widetilde{w}} \mapsto \#(\overline{I}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)\widetilde{w}\overline{I}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)/\overline{I}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1))$.*

Proof. The proof of Corollary 3.31 and Proposition 3.28 in [Viga] is applicable. $\square$

We have the following relation between q_s and $q_{\boldsymbol{M},s}$.

Lemma 4.5. *If $\widetilde{w}_1, \widetilde{w}_2 \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$ are $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive (resp. $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative), then we have $q^{-1}_{\widetilde{w}_1\widetilde{w}_2} q_{\widetilde{w}_1} q_{\widetilde{w}_2} = q^{-1}_{\boldsymbol{M},\widetilde{w}_1\widetilde{w}_2} q_{\boldsymbol{M},\widetilde{w}_1} q_{\boldsymbol{M},\widetilde{w}_2}$. In particular, we have $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w}_1) + \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w}_2) - \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w}_1\widetilde{w}_2) = \ell(\widetilde{w}_1) + \ell(\widetilde{w}_2) - \ell(\widetilde{w}_1\widetilde{w}_2)$.*

Proof. Put $C^{\pm} = \Sigma^{\pm}_{\mathrm{aff}} \setminus \Sigma^{\pm}_{\boldsymbol{M},\mathrm{aff}}$. By the definition, we have $q_{\widetilde{w}} = q_{\boldsymbol{M},\widetilde{w}} q(C^+ \cap \widetilde{w} C^-)$ for $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}(1)$. Hence it is sufficient to prove that

$$q(C^+ \cap \widetilde{w}_1 \widetilde{w}_2 C^-) = q(C^+ \cap \widetilde{w}_1 C^-) q(C^+ \cap \widetilde{w}_2 C^-).$$

Define $A^{\pm} = C^{\pm} \cap ((\Sigma^+ \setminus \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}) \times \mathbb{Z})$ and $B^{\pm} = C^{\pm} \cap ((\Sigma^- \setminus \Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}) \times \mathbb{Z})$. Then we have $C^{\pm} = A^{\pm} \cup B^{\pm}$. For $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$ and $w \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$, we have $\lambda n_w(\alpha, k) = (w(\alpha), n - \langle w(\alpha), \nu(\lambda) \rangle)$. If $w \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and $\alpha \notin \Sigma_{\boldsymbol{M}}$, we have $w(\alpha) > 0$ if and only if $\alpha > 0$. Hence if $\widetilde{w} \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$, we have $\widetilde{w}(A^+ \cup A^-) = A^+ \cup A^-$ and $\widetilde{w}(B^+ \cup B^-) = B^+ \cup B^-$. Hence $C^+ \cap \widetilde{w} C^- = (A^+ \cap \widetilde{w} A^-) \cup (B^+ \cap \widetilde{w} B^-)$. If λn_w is $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive then for $\alpha \in \Sigma^- \setminus \Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}$, we have $\langle \alpha, \nu(\lambda) \rangle \geq 0$. Hence $\widetilde{w} = \lambda n_w$ satisfies $\widetilde{w}(B^-) \subset B^-$. Therefore $C^+ \cap \widetilde{w} C^- = A^+ \cap \widetilde{w} A^-$. We also have $\widetilde{w}(A^+) \subset A^+$ and $\widetilde{w}(A^-) \supset A^-$ which will be used later.

Let $\widetilde{w}_1, \widetilde{w}_2 \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$ be $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive elements. Then we have

$$A^+ \cap \widetilde{w}_1 \widetilde{w}_2 A^- = (A^+ \cap \widetilde{w}_1 \widetilde{w}_2 A^- \cap \widetilde{w}_1 A^+) \amalg (A^+ \cap \widetilde{w}_1 \widetilde{w}_2 A^- \cap \widetilde{w}_1 A^-).$$

Since $\widetilde{w}_1 A^+ \subset A^+$, we have $A^+ \cap \widetilde{w}_1 \widetilde{w}_2 A^- \cap \widetilde{w}_1 A^+ = \widetilde{w}_1 \widetilde{w}_2 A^- \cap \widetilde{w}_1 A^+ = \widetilde{w}_1 (\widetilde{w}_2 A^- \cap A^+)$. Since $A^- \subset \widetilde{w}_2 A^-$, we have $A^+ \cap \widetilde{w}_1 \widetilde{w}_2 A^- \cap \widetilde{w}_1 A^- = A^+ \cap \widetilde{w}_1 A^-$. Hence

$$A^+ \cap \widetilde{w}_1 \widetilde{w}_2 A^- = \widetilde{w}_1 (A^+ \cap \widetilde{w}_2 A^-) \amalg (A^+ \cap \widetilde{w}_1 A^-).$$

Therefore,

$$q(A^+ \cap \widetilde{w}_1 \widetilde{w}_2 A^-) = q(\widetilde{w}_1 (A^+ \cap \widetilde{w}_2 A^-)) q(A^+ \cap \widetilde{w}_1 A^-).$$

Since $q(\widetilde{w}_1 (A^+ \cap \widetilde{w}_2 A^-)) = q(A^+ \cap \widetilde{w}_2 A^-)$, we get the lemma if $\widetilde{w}_1, \widetilde{w}_2$ are $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive. Since $q_{\widetilde{w}^{-1}} = q_{\widetilde{w}}$ and $q_{\boldsymbol{M},\widetilde{w}^{-1}} = q_{\boldsymbol{M},\widetilde{w}}$. the lemma holds if $\widetilde{w}_1, \widetilde{w}_2$ are $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative. □

We define a $C[q_s^{1/2}]$-module homomorphism $j^+_{\boldsymbol{M}} \colon \mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}} \to \mathcal{H}$ (resp. $j^-_{\boldsymbol{M}} \colon \mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}} \to \mathcal{H}$) by

$$j^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}(T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{\widetilde{w}}) = T_{\widetilde{w}} \quad (\text{resp. } j^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}(T^{\boldsymbol{M},*}_{\widetilde{w}}) = T^*_{\widetilde{w}})$$

for $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive (resp. $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative) $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$.

Lemma 4.6. *The $C[q_s^{1/2}]$-module homomorphisms $j^{\pm}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ are homomorphisms between $C[q_s^{1/2}]$-algebras. We have $j^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}(E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w})) = E(\widetilde{w})$, $j^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}(E^{\boldsymbol{M}}_-(\widetilde{w})) = E_-(\widetilde{w})$ for $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$ and $j^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}(E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w})) = E(\widetilde{w})$, $j^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}(E^{\boldsymbol{M}}_-(\widetilde{w})) = E_-(\widetilde{w})$ for $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$.*

Proof. We prove $j^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}(T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{\widetilde{w}_1} T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{\widetilde{w}_2}) = T_{\widetilde{w}_1} T_{\widetilde{w}_2}$ for $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive elements $\widetilde{w}_1, \widetilde{w}_2 \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$. By induction on $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w}_2)$, we may assume $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w}_2) = 0$ or $\widetilde{w}_2 = n_s$ for $s \in S_{\boldsymbol{M},\mathrm{aff}}$. If $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w}_2) = 0$, or $\widetilde{w}_2 = n_s$ and $\widetilde{w}_1 n_s > \widetilde{w}_1$, then $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w}_1) + \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w}_2) - \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w}_1 \widetilde{w}_2) = 0$. Hence $T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{\widetilde{w}_1} T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{\widetilde{w}_2} = T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{\widetilde{w}_1 \widetilde{w}_2}$. We have $\ell(\widetilde{w}_1) + \ell(\widetilde{w}_2) - \ell(\widetilde{w}_1 \widetilde{w}_2) = 0$ by Lemma 4.5. Therefore $T_{\widetilde{w}_1} T_{\widetilde{w}_2} = T_{\widetilde{w}_1 \widetilde{w}_2}$. We have $j^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}(T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{\widetilde{w}_1} T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{\widetilde{w}_2}) = T_{\widetilde{w}_1} T_{\widetilde{w}_2}$.

If $\widetilde{w}_2 = n_s$ and $\widetilde{w}_1 n_s < \widetilde{w}_1$, then we have $T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{\widetilde{w}_1} T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{n_s} = T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{\widetilde{w}_1 n_s^{-1}} (q_{\boldsymbol{M},s} T_{n_s^2} - T_{n_s} c_s) = q_{\boldsymbol{M},s} T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{\widetilde{w}_1 n_s} - T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{\widetilde{w}_1} c_s$. Therefore $j^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}(T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{\widetilde{w}_1} T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{\widetilde{w}_2}) = q_{\boldsymbol{M},s} T_{\widetilde{w}_1 n_s} - T_{\widetilde{w}_1} c_s$. We have $\ell(n_s^2) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}}(n_s^2) = 0$. Hence $2\ell(n_s) = \ell(n_s) + \ell(n_s) - \ell(n_s^2) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}}(n_s) + \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}}(n_s) - \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}}(n_s^2) = 2$ by Lemma 4.5. Therefore, $\ell(n_s) = 1$. Namely, $s \in S_{\mathrm{aff}}$. Therefore, by the definition of $q_{\boldsymbol{M},s}$, we have $q_{\boldsymbol{M},s} = q_s$. We also have $\ell(\widetilde{w}_1) + \ell(n_s) - \ell(\widetilde{w}_1 n_s) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w}_1) + \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}}(n_s) - \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w}_1 n_s) = 2$. Hence by the same calculation implies $T_{\widetilde{w}_1} T_{n_s} = q_s T_{\widetilde{w}_1 n_s} - T_{\widetilde{w}_1} c_s$. Therefore $j^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}(T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{\widetilde{w}_1} T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{\widetilde{w}_2}) = T_{\widetilde{w}_1} T_{\widetilde{w}_2}$. Hence $j^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ is an algebra homomorphism. By the same argument, $j^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ is an algebra homomorphism.

By the argument in the proof of [Oll10, Proposition 4.7], we have $j^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}(E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w})) = E(\widetilde{w})$ for $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$ and $j^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}(E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda)) = E(\lambda)$ for $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$. If $s \in S_{\boldsymbol{M}}$, then $s \in S$. Hence $j^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}(T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{n_s}) = j^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}(T^{\boldsymbol{M},*}_{n_s} + c_s) = T^*_{n_s} + c_s = T_{n_s}$.

Therefore $j^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}(T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{n_w}) = T_{n_w}$ for $w \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. In other words, we have $j^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}(E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(n_w)) = E(n_w)$. Since $j^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ is an algebra homomorphism, for $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$ and $w \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} j^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}(E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda n_w)) &= q^{-1/2}_{\boldsymbol{M},\lambda} q^{-1/2}_{\boldsymbol{M},n_w} q^{1/2}_{\boldsymbol{M},\lambda n_w} j^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}(E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda) E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(n_w)) \\ &= q^{-1/2}_{\lambda} q^{-1/2}_{n_w} q^{1/2}_{\lambda n_w} E(\lambda) E(n_w) \\ &= E(\lambda n_w) \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 4.5. A similar argument implies $j^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}(E^{\boldsymbol{M}}_-(\widetilde{w})) = E_-(\widetilde{w})$ for $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$ and $j^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}(E^{\boldsymbol{M}}_-(\widetilde{w})) = E_-(\widetilde{w})$ for $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$. □

Remark 4.7. Let $\lambda^+_0 \in \Lambda(1)$ be an $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive element such that it is in the center of $\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$ and $\langle \alpha, \nu(\lambda^+_0)\rangle < 0$ for any $\alpha \in \Sigma^+ \setminus \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Then $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ is a localization $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda^+_0)^{-1}\mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ of $\mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ at $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda^+_0)$.

We give a proof. First we prove that $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda^+_0)$ is in the center of $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Since λ^+_0 is in the center of $\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$, we have $n_{s_\alpha}\lambda^+_0 n^{-1}_{s_\alpha} = \lambda^+_0$ for any $\alpha \in \Phi_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Hence $s_\alpha(\nu(\lambda^+_0)) = \lambda^+_0$, namely $\langle \alpha, \nu(\lambda^+_0)\rangle = 0$. Therefore by the length formula (2.1), we have the length of λ^+_0 as an element of $\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$ is zero. Hence for $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$, we have $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda^+_0)E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w}) = E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda^+_0\widetilde{w}) = E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w}\lambda^+_0) = E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w})E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda^+_0)$. Therefore $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda^+_0)$ is in the center of $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and since the length of λ^+_0 is zero, it is invertible.

By the above argument, we have $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda^+_0)E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w}) = E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda^+_0\widetilde{w})$ for $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$. Moreover, for any $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $(\lambda^+_0)^n\widetilde{w}$ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-positive. Therefore $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\widetilde{w}) = E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda^+_0)^{-n}E^{\boldsymbol{M}}((\lambda^+_0)^n\widetilde{w})$ is in the image of the homomorphism $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda^+_0)^{-1}\mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}} \to \mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Hence we have $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda^+_0)^{-1}\mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}} \simeq \mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$.

In particular, if σ is an $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$-module, it is determined by its restriction to $\mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Since $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda^+_0)$ is in the center of $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$, if σ is irreducible, $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda^+_0)$ acts by a scalar on σ. Hence if σ is irreducible then its restriction to $\mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ is also irreducible.

This is also true for $\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Namely, for λ^-_0 such that it is in the center of $\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$ and $\langle \nu(\lambda^-_0), \alpha\rangle > 0$ for any $\alpha \in \Sigma^+ \setminus \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}$, we have $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda^-_0)^{-1}\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}} \simeq \mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$.

4.2. **Parabolic induction.**

Definition 4.8. Let $\boldsymbol{P} = \boldsymbol{MN}$ be a parabolic subgroup of $\boldsymbol{G}$. For a representation σ of $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}} \otimes C$, define

$$I_{\boldsymbol{P}}(\sigma) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}}(\mathcal{H}, \sigma).$$

Here, $\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ acts on $\mathcal{H}$ by the multiplication from the right through $j^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}$.

Set $W^{\boldsymbol{M}} = \{w \in W \mid w(\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}) \subset \Sigma^+\}$. This is a complete representative of $W/W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and for $w_1 \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and $w_2 \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$, we have $\ell(w_1w_2) = \ell(w_1) + \ell(w_2)$.

Lemma 4.9. *Let $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$, $w_1 \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and $w_2 \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Assume that λ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative. Then $\ell(n_{w_1w_2}\lambda) = \ell(n_{w_1}) + \ell(n_{w_2}\lambda)$. In particular, $T^*_{n_{w_1}}E_-(n_{w_2}\lambda) = E_-(n_{w_1w_2}\lambda)$.*

Proof. By the length formula (2.1), we have

$$\ell(n_{w_1w_2}\lambda) = \ell(\lambda) + \ell(n_{w_1w_2}) - 2\#\{\alpha \in \Sigma^+ \mid (w_1w_2)(\alpha) < 0, \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle < 0\}.$$

We have $\ell(w_1w_2) = \ell(w_1) + \ell(w_2)$. Hence for $\alpha \in \Sigma^+$, $(w_1w_2)(\alpha) < 0$ implies $w_2(\alpha) < 0$ or $\alpha = w_2^{-1}(\beta)$ for some $\beta \in \Sigma^+$ such that $w_1(\beta) < 0$. Assume that $\alpha = w_2^{-1}(\beta)$ for some $\beta \in \Sigma^+$ such that $w_1(\beta) < 0$. Since $w_1(\beta) < 0$, $\beta \in \Sigma^+ \setminus \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ by the definition of $W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Hence $\alpha = w_2^{-1}(\beta) \in \Sigma^+ \setminus \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Since λ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative, $\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle \geq 0$. Therefore,

$$\{\alpha \in \Sigma^+ \mid (w_1w_2)(\alpha) < 0, \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle < 0\} = \{\alpha \in \Sigma^+ \mid w_2(\alpha) < 0, \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle < 0\}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\ell(n_{w_1w_2}\lambda) &= \ell(\lambda)+\ell(n_{w_1w_2})-2\#\{\alpha\in\Sigma^+ \mid w_2(\alpha)<0, \langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle<0\}\\ &= \ell(\lambda)+\ell(n_{w_2})+\ell(n_{w_1})-2\#\{\alpha\in\Sigma^+ \mid w_2(\alpha)<0, \langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle<0\}\\ &= \ell(n_{w_2}\lambda)+\ell(n_{w_1}).\end{aligned}$$ □

Lemma 4.10 (See [Oll10, Proposition 5.2])**.** *The map $\varphi\mapsto(\varphi(T_{n_w}))_{w\in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}}$ gives an isomorphism $I_{\boldsymbol{P}}(\sigma)\simeq\bigoplus_{w\in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}}\sigma$ as vector spaces.*

Proof. We may replace $\varphi\mapsto\varphi(T_{n_w})$ with $\varphi\mapsto\varphi(T^*_{n_w})$. Take $\lambda_0^-\in\Lambda(1)$ as in Remark 4.7. Then φ is extended to $\mathcal{H}E(\lambda_0^-)^{-1}\to\sigma$. Fix $v\in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Then by the Bernstein relation and the definition of $E_-(\widetilde{w})$, $H_v=\bigoplus_{w\in W_{\boldsymbol{M}},\lambda\in\Lambda(1)}CE_-(n_{vw}\lambda)\subset\mathcal{H}\otimes C$ is right $j^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}})$-stable. We prove $\Phi_0\colon\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}\ni F\mapsto T^*_{n_v}j^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}(F)\in H_v$ induces an isomorphism $\Phi\colon\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}\otimes C\simeq H_vE(\lambda_0^-)^{-1}$.

Let $w\in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and $\lambda\in\Lambda(1)$ such that λ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative. Then by Lemma 4.9, we have $T^*_{n_v}E_-(n_w\lambda)=E_-(n_{vw}\lambda)$. Hence Φ_0 is injective. Therefore Φ is injective.

We prove surjectivity. Let $w\in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and $\lambda\in\Lambda(1)$. Take $n\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq0}$ such that $\lambda(\lambda_0^-)^n$ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative. If $\ell(n_{vw}\lambda(\lambda_0^-)^n)=\ell(n_{vw}\lambda)+\ell((\lambda_0^-)^n)$, then $E_-(n_{vw}\lambda)=E_-(n_{vw}\lambda(\lambda_0^-)^n)E(\lambda_0^-)^{-n}=T^*_{n_v}E_-(n_w\lambda(\lambda_0^-)^n)E(\lambda_0^-)^{-n}\in\operatorname{Im}\Phi$ by Lemma 4.9. If $\ell(n_{vw}\lambda(\lambda_0^-)^n)>\ell(n_{vw}\lambda)+\ell((\lambda_0^-)^n)$, then $E_-(n_{vw}\lambda)E(\lambda_0^-)^n=0$. Hence, in $H_vE(\lambda_0^-)^{-1}$, $E(n_{vw}\lambda)=0$.

Therefore $(\mathcal{H}\otimes C)E(\lambda_0^-)^{-1}=\bigoplus_{v\in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}}H_vE(\lambda_0^-)^{-1}\simeq\bigoplus_{v\in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}}(\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}\otimes C)$. Since $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}=\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda_0^-)^{-1}$ by Remark 4.7, we have $I_P(\sigma)=\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}}(\mathcal{H},\sigma)=\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}}((\mathcal{H}\otimes C)E(\lambda_0^-)^{-1},\sigma)\simeq\bigoplus_{v\in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}}\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}}(\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}\otimes C,\sigma)\simeq\bigoplus_{v\in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}}\sigma$. □

For $w\in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$, we denote the subspace $\{\varphi\in I_{\boldsymbol{P}}(\sigma)\mid\varphi(T_{n_v})=0\ (v\in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}\backslash\{w\})\}$ by $w\sigma$. We have $I_{\boldsymbol{P}}(\sigma)=\bigoplus_{w\in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}}w\sigma$. By the lemma below, $w\sigma$ is $\mathcal{A}$-stable.

Remark 4.11. Let $v\in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$, $\varphi\in v\sigma\subset I_{\boldsymbol{P}}(\sigma)$ and $\lambda\in\Lambda(1)$. From the proof of the above lemma, if $w\in\{v_0\in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}\mid v_0<v\}W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ then $\varphi(E_-(n_w\lambda))=0$. We remark that if w is in this subset and $w_1\leq w$, then w_1 is also in this subset. (It follows from [Abe13, Lemma 4.20]. See also the proof of Lemma 4.13.)

We can describe the $\mathcal{A}$-module structure of $I_{\boldsymbol{P}}(\sigma)$ using the above decomposition.

Proposition 4.12. *Let σ be an $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}\otimes C$-module. Define an $\mathcal{A}$-module $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ by*

- *$\sigma=\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ as vector spaces.*
- *for $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative $\lambda\in\Lambda(1)$ we have $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(E(\lambda))=\sigma(E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda))$.*
- *for $\lambda\in\Lambda(1)$ which is not $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative, $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(E(\lambda))=0$.*

Then $\varphi\mapsto(\varphi(T_{n_w}))_{w\in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}}$ gives an isomorphism $I_P(\sigma)|_{\mathcal{A}}\simeq\bigoplus_{w\in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}}w\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Proof. We prove $(\varphi E(\lambda))(T_{n_w})=\varphi(T_{n_w})\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(E(n_w^{-1}(\lambda)))$ by induction on $\ell(w)$.

If $w=1$, then $(\varphi E(\lambda))(1)=\varphi(E(\lambda))$. If λ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative, then $\varphi(E(\lambda))=\varphi(1)E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda)=\varphi(1)\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(E(\lambda))$. Assume that λ is not $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative. Take $\lambda_0^-\in\Lambda(1)$ as in Remark 4.7. Since λ is not $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative, $\nu(\lambda)$ and $\nu(\lambda_0^-)$ do not belong to the same closed chamber. Hence $E(\lambda)E(\lambda_0^-)=0$ by (3.1). Therefore $\varphi(E(\lambda))=\varphi(E(\lambda)E(\lambda_0^-))E^{\boldsymbol{M}}((\lambda_0^-)^{-1})=0=\varphi(1)\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(E(\lambda))$.

Assume that $w\neq1$ and take $\alpha\in\Delta$ such that $s=s_\alpha$ satisfies $sw<w$. Since $\{\beta\in\Sigma^+\mid sw(\beta)<0\}\subset\{\beta\in\Sigma^+\mid w(\beta)<0\}$, $sw\in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Since $w(-w^{-1}(\alpha))=-\alpha<0$ and $w\in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$, we have $-w^{-1}(\alpha)\in\Sigma^+\setminus\Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Assume that $\langle\nu(\lambda),\alpha\rangle>0$.

Then by Lemma 2.13, $E(\lambda)T_{n_s} = (T_{n_s} - c_s)E(n_s^{-1}(\lambda))$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}(\varphi E(\lambda))(T_{n_w}) &= \varphi(E(\lambda)T_{n_w}) \\ &= \varphi(E(\lambda)T_{n_s}T_{n_{sw}}) \\ &= \varphi((T_{n_s} - c_s)E(n_s^{-1}(\lambda))T_{n_{sw}}) \\ &= (\varphi(T_{n_s} - c_s)E(n_s^{-1}(\lambda)))(T_{n_{sw}}).\end{aligned}$$

Applying the inductive hypothesis to $\varphi(T_{n_s} - c_s)$, $(\varphi(T_{n_s} - c_s)E(n_s^{-1}(\lambda)))(T_{n_{sw}}) = (\varphi(T_{n_s} - c_s))(T_{n_{sw}})\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(E(n_w^{-1}(\lambda)))$. Since $\langle \nu(n_w^{-1}(\lambda)), -w^{-1}(\alpha)\rangle = -\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle < 0$, $n_w^{-1}(\lambda)$ is not $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative. Hence $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(E(n_w^{-1}(\lambda))) = 0$. Therefore $(\varphi(T_{n_s} - c_s))(T_{n_{sw}})\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(E(n_w^{-1}(\lambda))) = 0 = \varphi(T_{n_w})\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(E(n_w^{-1}(\lambda)))$.

If $\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle = 0$, then $E(\lambda)T_{n_s} = T_{n_s}E(n_s^{-1}(\lambda))$ [Viga, Lemma 5.34, 5.35]. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}(\varphi E(\lambda))(T_{n_w}) &= \varphi(E(\lambda)T_{n_s}T_{n_{sw}}) \\ &= \varphi(T_{n_s}E(n_s^{-1}(\lambda))T_{n_{sw}}) \\ &= \varphi(T_{n_w})\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(E(n_w^{-1}(\lambda))).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, assume that $\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle < 0$. Then $\langle \nu(n_{sw}^{-1}(\lambda)), -w^{-1}(\alpha)\rangle = \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle < 0$. Hence $n_{sw}^{-1}(\lambda)$ is not $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative. Therefore, we have $\varphi(E(\lambda)c_sT_{n_{sw}}) = (\varphi(\lambda \cdot c_s)E(\lambda))(T_{n_{sw}}) = (\varphi(\lambda \cdot c_s))(T_{n_{sw}})\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(E(n_{sw}^{-1}(\lambda))) = 0$. By Lemma 2.13, $E(\lambda)(T_{n_s} - c_s) = T_{n_s}E(n_s^{-1}(\lambda))$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}(\varphi E(\lambda))(T_{n_w}) &= \varphi(E(\lambda)(T_{n_s} - c_s)T_{n_{sw}}) \\ &= (\varphi T_{n_s})(E(n_s^{-1}(\lambda))T_{n_{sw}}) \\ &= \varphi(T_{n_w})\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(E(n_w^{-1}(\lambda))).\end{aligned}$$

□

4.3. **Another description of parabolic induction.** We give a realization of parabolic induction via a tensor product. First we find a submodule of a pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra of a Levi subgroup (which is not $\boldsymbol{M}$ in general) in $I_{\boldsymbol{P}}(\sigma)$.

Set $\boldsymbol{P}' = n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}\boldsymbol{P}n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}^{-1}$. This is a standard parabolic subgroup of $\boldsymbol{G}$ corresponding to $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}(\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}) = -w_\Delta(\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}})$. Let $\boldsymbol{M}'$ be the Levi part of $\boldsymbol{P}$. Then the map $m \mapsto n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}mn_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}^{-1}$ is an isomorphism between $\boldsymbol{M}$ and $\boldsymbol{M}'$. Moreover, this map preserves the maximal split torus, the pro-p-Iwahori subgroup, the minimal parabolic subgroup, the root system, the set of simple roots etc... Since the pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra is defined by these data, this map induces an isomorphism $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}} \to \mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}'}$. Explicitly it is given by $T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_{\widetilde{w}} \mapsto T^{\boldsymbol{M}'}_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}\widetilde{w}n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}^{-1}}$. We also have $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}_-(\widetilde{w}) \mapsto E^{\boldsymbol{M}'}_-(n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}\widetilde{w}n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}^{-1})$. Notice that $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$.

Lemma 4.13. *Let $v \in W$.*

1. *We have $W \setminus w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}W_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \{v \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}} \mid v < w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}\}W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$.*
2. *If $v < w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}$, then $v \notin w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$.*
3. *If $v \notin w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and $v' \leq v$, then $v' \notin w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$.*

Proof. Let $w \in W$ and take $w_1 \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and $w_2 \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ such that $w = w_1w_2$. If $w_1 < w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}$, then, since $W/W_{\boldsymbol{M}} \simeq W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$, $w_1W_{\boldsymbol{M}} \cap w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}W_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \emptyset$. Hence $w \notin w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Assume that $w \notin w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Since $w_1 \leq w_\Delta = w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}$ and $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$, we have $w_1 \leq w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}$ by [Abe13, Lemma 4.20]. If $w_1 = w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}$, then $w \in w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Hence $w_1 < w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}$. We get (1).

Assume that $v \in w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and take $v' \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ such that $v = w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}v'$. Since $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and $v' \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$, we have $\ell(w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}v') = \ell(w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}) + \ell(v')$. Hence $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} \leq w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}v' = v$. We get (2).

We prove (3). Take $v_1 \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and $v_2 \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ such that $v = v_1v_2$. By (1), $v_1 < w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}$. Take $v_1' \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and $v_2' \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ such that $v' = v_1'v_2'$. Then $v_1'v_2' \leq v_1v_2$.

Since $v_1' \leq v_1'v_2'$, we have $v_1' \leq v_1v_2$. By [Abe13, Lemma 4.20], we have $v_1' \leq v_1$. Since $v_1 < w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}$, we have $v_1' < w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}$. Hence we get (3) by (2). □

Proposition 4.14. *Let σ be an $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$-module and define an $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}'}$-module σ' by pulling back σ by the above isomorphism. (Namely it is given by $\sigma'(E_-^{\boldsymbol{M}'}(\widetilde{w})) = \sigma(E_-^{\boldsymbol{M}}(n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}^{-1}\widetilde{w}n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}))$ for $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}'}(1)$. Then $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}\sigma \subset I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q})$ is $\mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}'}$-stable and isomorphic to σ'. In particular, if σ is irreducible and an $\mathcal{H}$-submodule π of $I_{\boldsymbol{P}}(\sigma)$ has a non-zero intersection with $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}\sigma$, then π contains $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}\sigma$.*

Proof. Let $w \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$, $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$. Put $w_1 = w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} w (w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}})^{-1}$ and $\lambda_1 = n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}(\lambda)$. We prove $\varphi(E_-(n_{w_1}\lambda_1)T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}}) = \varphi(T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}}E_-(n_w\lambda))$ for $\varphi \in w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}\sigma$

Since $w \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$, we have $\ell(w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}) + \ell(w) = \ell(w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} w)$. Hence $n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}} n_w = n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} w}$. We have $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} w = w_1 w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}$ and by the same argument implies $n_{w_1 w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}} = n_{w_1} n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}$. Hence $n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}} n_w = n_{w_1} n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}$. Therefore $n_{w_1}^{-1} n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}} = n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}} n_w^{-1}$. Since $w^{-1} \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$, we also have $\ell(n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}} n_w^{-1}) = \ell(n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}) + \ell(n_w^{-1})$. Hence $T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}} n_w^{-1}} = T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}} T_{n_w^{-1}}$. The same argument implies $T_{n_{w_1}^{-1} n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}} = T_{n_{w_1}^{-1}} T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}}$. Hence in $\mathcal{H}$, we have $T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}} T_{n_w^{-1}} = T_{n_{w_1}^{-1}} T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}}$. Therefore we get $T^{-1}_{n_{w_1}^{-1}} T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}} = T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}} T^{-1}_{n_w^{-1}}$. The definition of $T^*_{n_w}$ is $T^*_{n_w} = q_{n_w} T^{-1}_{n_w^{-1}}$. Hence $T^*_{n_{w_1}} T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}} = T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}} T^*_{n_w}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}} E_-(n_w\lambda) - E_-(n_{w_1}\lambda_1) T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}} \\
&\in C[q_s^{\pm 1/2}](T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}} T^*_{n_w}\theta(\lambda) - T^*_{n_{w_1}}\theta(\lambda_1) T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}}) \\
&= C[q_s^{\pm 1/2}] T^*_{n_{w_1}} (T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}}\theta(\lambda) - \theta(\lambda_1) T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}})
\end{aligned}$$

By the Bernstein relation, we have

$$T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}}\theta(\lambda) - \theta(\lambda_1) T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}} \in \sum_{v < w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}, \mu \in \Lambda(1)} C[q_s^{\pm 1/2}] T_{n_v}\theta(\mu).$$

We have

$$\sum_{v < w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}} C[q_s^{\pm 1/2}] T_{n_v} \subset \sum_{v < w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}} C[q_s^{\pm 1/2}][Z_\kappa] T^*_{n_v}$$

and $T^*_{n_{w_1}} T^*_{n_v} \in \sum_{w_1' \leq w_1, v' \leq v, w' \leq w_1'v'} C[q_s^{\pm 1/2}][Z_\kappa] T^*_{n_{w'}}$.

Let w', w_1', v', v as above, namely $v < w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}, w_1' \leq w_1, v' \leq v$ and $w' \leq w_1'v'$. Then $v' < w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}$. Hence $v' \in W \setminus w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} W_{\boldsymbol{M}} = W \setminus W_{\boldsymbol{M}'} w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}$ by the above lemma (2). Since $w_1 \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}'}$, we have $w_1' \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}'}$. Hence

$$w_1'v' \in W \setminus W_{\boldsymbol{M}'} w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} = W \setminus w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} W_{\boldsymbol{M}}.$$

Therefore, if $w' \leq w'_1 v'$, then $w' \in W \setminus w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} W_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \{v \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}} \mid v < w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}\} W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ by the above lemma (1) and (3). Hence we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}} E_-(n_w\lambda) - E_-(n_{w_1}\lambda_1) T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}} \\
&\in \left(\sum_{a \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}, a < w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}, b \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}, \mu \in \Lambda(1)} C[q_s^{\pm 1/2}] T^*_{n_{ab}} \theta(\mu) \right) \cap \mathcal{H} \\
&= \left(\sum_{a \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}, a < w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}, b \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}, \mu \in \Lambda(1)} C[q_s^{\pm 1/2}] E_-(n_{ab}\mu) \right) \cap \mathcal{H} \\
&= \sum_{a \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}, a < w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}, b \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}, \mu \in \Lambda(1)} C[q_s^{1/2}] E_-(n_{ab}\mu)
\end{aligned}$$

By Remark 4.11, φ is zero on this space. □

Proposition 4.15. *Keep the notation in Proposition 4.14. Then we have* $\sigma' \otimes_{\mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}'}} \mathcal{H} \simeq I_{\boldsymbol{P}}(\sigma)$.

Proof. We get $\Phi\colon \sigma' \otimes_{\mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}'}} \mathcal{H} \to I_{\boldsymbol{P}}(\sigma)$ by Proposition 4.14. Put ${}^{\boldsymbol{M}'}W = \{w^{-1} \mid w \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}'}\}$. Then for $w_1 \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}'}$ and $w_2 \in {}^{\boldsymbol{M}'}W$, we have $\ell(w_1 w_2) = \ell(w_1) + \ell(w_2)$. By a similar argument of the proof of Lemma 4.10, the homomorphism $(x_w)_w \mapsto \sum_w x_w \otimes T^*_{n_w}$ gives an isomorphism $\bigoplus_{w \in {}^{\boldsymbol{M}'}W} \sigma' \simeq \sigma' \otimes_{\mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}'}} \mathcal{H}$. By the construction, Φ induces an isomorphism $\sigma' \simeq \sigma' \otimes 1 \to w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} \sigma \subset I_{\boldsymbol{P}}(\sigma)$.

First we prove that $v \mapsto w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} v^{-1}$ gives a bijection $W^{\boldsymbol{M}} \to {}^{\boldsymbol{M}'}W$. We have $w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} w_\Delta(\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}'}) = w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}(-\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}) = \Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Hence $(w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} v^{-1})^{-1}(\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}'}) \subset v(\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}) \subset \Sigma^+$. Therefore the map is well-defined. The inverse map is given by $w \mapsto w^{-1} w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}$.

We prove that the homomorphism Φ induces an isomorphism $\sigma' \otimes T^*_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} v^{-1}}} \simeq v\sigma$ for $v \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$. To do it, it is sufficient to prove the following: Let $w \in {}^{\boldsymbol{M}'}W$ and $v \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Take $x \in \sigma'$ and put $\varphi = \Phi(x \otimes T^*_{n_w})$. Then we have $\varphi(T_{n_v}) = x$ if $wv = w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}$ and if not, $\varphi(T_{n_v}) = 0$.

Put $\varphi' = \Phi(x \otimes 1)$. Then $\varphi(T_{n_v}) = \varphi'(T^*_{n_w} T_{n_v})$. We have

$$T^*_{n_w} T_{n_v} = E_{w(-\Delta)}(n_w) E_{-\Delta}(n_v) = (q^{-1}_{n_w n_v} q_{n_w} q_{n_v})^{1/2} E_{w(-\Delta)}(n_w n_v).$$

Hence it is zero if $\ell(w) + \ell(v) > \ell(wv)$. Assume that $\ell(w) + \ell(v) = \ell(wv)$. Then $T^*_{n_w} T_{n_v} = E_{w(-\Delta)}(n_w n_v) = E_{w(-\Delta)}(n_{wv}) \in T_{n_{wv}} + \sum_{v' < wv} C[Z_\kappa] T_{n_{v'}}$.

Assume that $wv \notin w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Then $v' < wv$ implies $v' \in W \setminus w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} W_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \{v_0 \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}} \mid v_0 < w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}\} W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ by Lemma 4.13 (1) and (3). Hence by Remark 4.11, we have $\varphi'(C[Z_\kappa] T_{n_{v'}}) = 0$. We also have $\varphi'(T_{n_{wv}}) = 0$. Hence $\varphi'(T^*_{n_w} T_{n_v}) = 0$.

Assume that $wv \in w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Take $y \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ such that $wv = w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} y$. Since $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} w_\Delta \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}'}$ and $w \in {}^{\boldsymbol{M}'}W$, we have

$$\ell(w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} w_\Delta w) = \ell(w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} w_\Delta) + \ell(w). \tag{4.2}$$

Since $v \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and $y \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$, we have $\ell(y v^{-1}) = \ell(y) + \ell(v)$. Hence by $wv = w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} y$, the left hand side of (4.2) is

$$\ell(w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} w_\Delta w) = \ell(w_\Delta y v^{-1}) = \ell(w_\Delta) - \ell(y v^{-1}) = \ell(w_\Delta) - \ell(y) - \ell(v).$$

Recall that we assumed $\ell(wv) = \ell(w) + \ell(v)$. Similarly, the right hand side of (4.2) is

$$\begin{aligned}\ell(w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} w_\Delta) + \ell(w) &= \ell(w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}) + \ell(w)\\ &= \ell(w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}) + \ell(wv) - \ell(v)\\ &= \ell(w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}) + \ell(w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} y) - \ell(v)\\ &= \ell(w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}) + \ell(w_\Delta) - \ell(w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} y) - \ell(v)\\ &= \ell(w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}) + \ell(w_\Delta) - \ell(w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}) + \ell(y) - \ell(v)\\ &= \ell(w_\Delta) + \ell(y) - \ell(v)\end{aligned}$$

We get $\ell(y) = 0$. Hence $wv = w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}$. Therefore we have $T^*_{n_w} T_{n_v} \in T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}} + \sum_{w' < w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}} C[Z_\kappa] T_{n_{w'}}$. We have $\varphi'(T_{n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}}) = x$. Moreover, for $w' \in W$ such that $w' < wv = w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}$, $w' \notin w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}} W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ by Lemma 4.13. Hence by Remark 4.11, we get $\varphi'(C[Z_\kappa] T_{n_{w'}}) = 0$. Therefore $\varphi'(T^*_{n_w} T_{n_v}) = x$. □

4.4. **Extension of a module.** In this subsection, assume that an orthogonal decomposition $\Delta = \Delta_1 \amalg \Delta_2$ is given. Then we have the decomposition $S = S_1 \amalg S_2$ and $S_{\mathrm{aff}} = S_{\mathrm{aff},1} \amalg S_{\mathrm{aff},2}$. Let $\boldsymbol{M}_1$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{M}_2$) be the Levi subgroup corresponding to Δ_1 (resp. Δ_2).

To formulate the classification theorem, we need the following proposition.

Proposition 4.16. *Let σ be an $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1} \otimes C$-module such that $E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda)$ acts trivially for $\lambda \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)$. Then there exists a unique $\mathcal{H} \otimes C$-module $e(\sigma)$ such that:*

- *as an $\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}$-module, $e(\sigma) = \sigma$.*
- *for $s \in S_{\mathrm{aff},2}$, T_{n_s} is zero on $e(\sigma)$.*
- *T_t acts trivially for $t \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1) \cap Z_\kappa$.*

We call the module $e(\sigma)$ *the extension of* σ.

We summarize some facts which come from the orthogonal decomposition. We have a decomposition as Coxeter groups $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}} = \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}} \times \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_2,\mathrm{aff}}$. Put $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_i}(\widetilde{w}) = \#(\Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_i,\mathrm{aff}} \cap \widetilde{w}(\Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_i,\mathrm{aff}}))$ for $i = 1, 2$. Since $\Sigma^\pm_{\mathrm{aff}} = \Sigma^\pm_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}} \amalg \Sigma^\pm_{\boldsymbol{M}_2,\mathrm{aff}}$ and the action of $\widetilde{W}$ preserves this decomposition, we have $\ell(\widetilde{w}) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}) + \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w})$. If $\widetilde{w} \in \boldsymbol{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_i}(1)$, then $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_i}(\widetilde{w})$ is the usual length of $\widetilde{w}$. It is easy to see that $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_i}(\widetilde{w}^{-1}) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_i}(\widetilde{w})$ for $i = 1, 2$. If $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}) = 0$, then $\widetilde{w}(\Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}) \subset \Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}$. By $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}^{-1}) = 0$, we have $\widetilde{w}^{-1}(\Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}) \subset \Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}$, hence $\widetilde{w}(\Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}) \supset \Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}$. Therefore $\widetilde{w}(\Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}) = \Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}$. Hence for any $\widetilde{w}_1 \in \widetilde{W}(1)$, we have $\widetilde{w}_1\widetilde{w}(\Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}) = \widetilde{w}_1(\Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}})$. We get $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}_1\widetilde{w}) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}_1)$. If $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}(1)$, then its image in $\widetilde{W}$ is contained in $\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}$. The group $\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}$ is generated by $S_{\mathrm{aff},1}$ and, since the decomposition is orthogonal, $\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}$ acts trivially on $\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{M}_2,\mathrm{aff}}$. Hence $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w}) = 0$ for $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}(1)$. Set $\Omega = \{\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W} \mid \ell(\widetilde{w}) = 0\}$. If $\widetilde{w} \in \Omega$, then $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}) + \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w}) = \ell(\widetilde{w}) = 0$. Hence $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w}) = 0$. We have $\widetilde{W} = \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}\Omega = \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_2,\mathrm{aff}}\Omega$. Let $\Omega(1)$ be the inverse image of Ω by $\widetilde{W}(1) \to \widetilde{W}$. Since $\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_i,\mathrm{aff}}(1) \to \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_i,\mathrm{aff}}$ is surjective for $i = 1, 2$, we get $\widetilde{W} = \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}(1)\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_2,\mathrm{aff}}(1)\Omega(1)$. Namely, for any $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}(1)$, we can find $\widetilde{w}_1 \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}(1)$, $\widetilde{w}_2 \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_2,\mathrm{aff}}(1)$ and $u \in \widetilde{W}(1)$ such that $\ell(u) = 0$ and $\widetilde{w} = \widetilde{w}_1\widetilde{w}_2 u$. Since $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}_2) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(u) = 0$, we have $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}_1)$. We have proved (1)–(3) of the following lemma.

Lemma 4.17. *Let $\widetilde{w}, \widetilde{v} \in \widetilde{W}(1)$.*

(1) *We have $\ell(\widetilde{w}) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}) + \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w})$.*
(2) *If $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_i}(\widetilde{w}) = 0$, then $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_i}(\widetilde{w}\widetilde{v}) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_i}(\widetilde{v}\widetilde{w}) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_i}(\widetilde{v})$ for $i = 1, 2$.*

(3) *There exists* $\widetilde{w}_1 \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}(1)$, $\widetilde{w}_2 \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_2,\mathrm{aff}}(1)$ *and* $u \in \widetilde{W}(1)$ *such that* $\ell(u) = 0$ *and* $\widetilde{w} = \widetilde{w}_1\widetilde{w}_2 u$. *We have* $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}_1)$ *and* $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w}) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w}_2)$. *In particular, there exists* $\widetilde{w}_1 \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}(1)$ *and* $u \in \widetilde{W}(1)$ *such that* $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(u) = 0$ *and* $\widetilde{w} = \widetilde{w}_1 u$.

(4) *Let* $\widetilde{w}_1, \widetilde{w}_2 \in \widetilde{W}(1)$ *such that* $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}_1) = 0$ *and* $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w}_2) = 0$. *Then* $\ell(\widetilde{w}_1\widetilde{w}_2) = \ell(\widetilde{w}_1) + \ell(\widetilde{w}_2)$.

(5) *If* $\widetilde{w} \le \widetilde{v}$, *then* $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_i}(\widetilde{w}) \le \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_i}(\widetilde{v})$ *for* $i = 1, 2$

(6) *For* $w \in W$, $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$ *and* $i = 1, 2$, *we have*

$$\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_i}(\lambda n_w) = \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_i}, w^{-1}(\alpha) > 0} |\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle| + \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_i}, w^{-1}(\alpha) < 0} |\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle - 1|.$$

(7) *For* $i = 1, 2$, $\Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_i}(1)$ *is normal in* $\widetilde{W}(1)$.

Proof. We may assume $i = 1$ in (5), (6) and (7).

We prove (4). Since $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}_1) = 0$, $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}_1\widetilde{w}_2) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}_2)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell(\widetilde{w}_1\widetilde{w}_2) &= \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}_1\widetilde{w}_2) + \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w}_1\widetilde{w}_2) \\
&= \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}_2) + \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w}_1) \\
&= (\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}_2) + \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w}_2)) + (\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w}_1) + \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w}_1)) \\
&= \ell(\widetilde{w}_1) + \ell(\widetilde{w}_2).
\end{aligned}$$

For (5), we prove the same statement in the group $\widetilde{W}$. Let $\widetilde{w}, \widetilde{v} \in \widetilde{W}$. Take $\widetilde{w}_1, \widetilde{v}_1 \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}$, $\widetilde{w}_2, \widetilde{v}_2 \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_2,\mathrm{aff}}$ and $u, u' \in \Omega$ such that $\widetilde{w} = \widetilde{w}_1\widetilde{w}_2 u$ and $\widetilde{v} = \widetilde{v}_1\widetilde{v}_2 u'$. Then $\widetilde{w} \le \widetilde{v}$ implies $\widetilde{w}_1 \le \widetilde{v}_1$, $\widetilde{w}_2 \le \widetilde{v}_2$ and $u = u'$. Since $\widetilde{w}_1, \widetilde{v}_1 \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}$, if $\widetilde{w}_1 \le \widetilde{v}_1$ with respect to the Bruhat order of $\widetilde{W}$, then $\widetilde{w}_1 \le \widetilde{v}_1$ with respect to the Bruhat order of $\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}$. Hence $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}_1) \le \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{v}_1)$. On the other hand, we have $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}_1)$ and $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{v}) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{v}_1)$. Hence we get (5).

We prove (6). If $w \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}$, this is the length formula (2.1). In general, take $w_1 \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}$ and $w_2 \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}$ such that $w = w_1 w_2$. Then we have $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(w_2) = 0$. Hence $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda n_{w_1 w_2}) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda n_{w_1})$. Since $\lambda n_{w_1} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)$, applying the length formula (2.1) we get

$$\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda n_w) = \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}, w_1^{-1}(\alpha) > 0} |\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle| + \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}, w_1^{-1}(\alpha) < 0} |\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle - 1|.$$

For $\alpha \in \Sigma_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}$, $w_2^{-1}w_1^{-1}(\alpha) = w_1^{-1}w_2^{-1}(\alpha) = w_1^{-1}(\alpha)$ since $w_2 \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}$ and $w_1 \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}$. Therefore $w^{-1}(\alpha) = (w_1 w_2)^{-1}(\alpha) = w_1^{-1}(\alpha)$. Since M'_1 is normal in G [AHHV14, II.7 Remark 4], we have (7). □

Now we give a proof of Proposition 4.16. For the proof, let I be the two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{H} \otimes C$ generated by $\{T_{n_s} \mid s \in S_{\mathrm{aff},2}\} \cup \{T_t - 1 \mid t \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1) \cap Z_\kappa\}$ and J the two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1} \otimes C$ generated by $\{E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda) - 1 \mid \lambda \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)\}$. Then Proposition 4.16 follows from

$$(\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1} \otimes C)/(J \cap (\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1} \otimes C)) \xrightarrow{\sim} (\mathcal{H} \otimes C)/I.$$

We prove it. We need a lemma.

Lemma 4.18. (1) *We have*

$$I = \bigoplus_{\widetilde{w}\in \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)\backslash \widetilde{W}(1)} \left(I \cap \bigoplus_{\widetilde{v}\in \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)} CT_{\widetilde{v}\widetilde{w}} \right)$$
$$= \bigoplus_{\widetilde{w}\in \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)\backslash \widetilde{W}(1)} \left(I \cap \bigoplus_{\widetilde{v}\in \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)} CE(\widetilde{v}\widetilde{w}) \right).$$

(2) *If $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_2,\mathrm{aff}}(1)$, then $T^*_{\widetilde{w}} \in 1 + I$.*
(3) *Let $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$, $w \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}$, $a \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_2,\mathrm{aff}}(1)$ and $b \in \widetilde{W}(1)$ such that λn_w is $\boldsymbol{M}_1$-negative, $\lambda n_w = ab$ and $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(b) = 0$. Then $E(\lambda n_w) \in T_b + \sum_{c<b} CT_c + I$.*
(4) *The subspace $(\bigoplus_{\widetilde{w}\in \widetilde{W}(1),\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w})=0} CT_{\widetilde{w}}) \cap I$ is in the ideal of $\mathcal{H}$ generated by $\{T_t - 1 \mid t \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1) \cap Z_\kappa\}$.*

Proof. Since $\{n_s \mid s \in S_{\mathrm{aff},2}\}$ and $\Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)$ are contained in $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)$, the statement (1) is easy. For (2), we may assume $\widetilde{w} = n_s$ for $s \in S_{\mathrm{aff},2}$ or $\widetilde{w} = t$ for $t \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1) \cap Z_\kappa$. If $\widetilde{w} = n_s$, then $T^*_{n_s} = T_{n_s} - c_s$. By the description of c_s, we have $c_s \in -1 + I$. Hence $T^*_{n_s} \in 1 + I$. For $t \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1) \cap Z_\kappa$, $T^*_t = T_t \in 1 + I$ by the definition of I.

We prove (3). Take anti-dominant elements $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(1)$ such that $\lambda = \lambda_1^{-1}\lambda_2$. Since λ is $\boldsymbol{M}_1$-negative, namely $\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle \geq 0$ for any $\alpha \in \Sigma^+ \setminus \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_1} = \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}$, we can take λ_1, λ_2 such that $\langle \nu(\lambda_2), \alpha\rangle = 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}$. Then by the length formula (2.1), we have $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\lambda_2) = 0$. Take $\widetilde{v}_1 \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_2,\mathrm{aff}}(1)$ and $\widetilde{v}_2 \in \widetilde{W}(1)$ such that $\lambda_1^{-1} = \widetilde{v}_1\widetilde{v}_2$ and $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{v}_2) = 0$. Then $\lambda n_w = \widetilde{v}_1\widetilde{v}_2\lambda_2 n_w$. Put $a' = \widetilde{v}_1$ and $b' = \widetilde{v}_2\lambda_2 n_w$. Then $a' \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_2,\mathrm{aff}}(1)$ and $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(b') = 0$. Set $u = (a')^{-1}a = b'b^{-1}$. Then $u \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_2,\mathrm{aff}}(1)$ and $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(u) = 0$. Hence the image of u in $\widetilde{W}$ is in $\{w \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_2,\mathrm{aff}} \mid \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(w) = 0\} = \{1\}$. Therefore $u \in Z_\kappa$. Hence $u \in Z_\kappa \cap W_{\boldsymbol{M}_2,\mathrm{aff}}(1) = \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1) \cap Z_\kappa$. Replacing $\widetilde{v}_1$ with $\widetilde{v}_1 u$ and $\widetilde{v}_2$ with $u^{-1}\widetilde{v}_2$ (these satisfy the same conditions), we have $a = \widetilde{v}_1$ and $b = \widetilde{v}_2\lambda_2 n_w$.

By (4) of the above lemma, we have $\ell(\lambda_1^{-1}) = \ell(\widetilde{v}_1) + \ell(\widetilde{v}_2)$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(\lambda n_w) &\in C[q_s^{\pm 1/2}]E(\lambda_1^{-1})E(\lambda_2 n_w) \\ &= C[q_s^{\pm 1/2}]T^*_{\lambda_1^{-1}}E(\lambda_2 n_w) \\ &= C[q_s^{\pm 1/2}]T^*_a T^*_{\widetilde{v}_2}E(\lambda_2 n_w) \\ &\subset T^*_a \left(\sum_{c_1 \leq \lambda_2 n_w} C[q_s^{\pm 1/2}]T^*_{\widetilde{v}_2} T^*_{c_1} \right) \\ &\subset T^*_a \left(\sum_{c_1 \leq \lambda_2 n_w, c_2 \leq \widetilde{v}_2, c_3 \leq c_1, c_4 \leq c_2 c_3} C[q_s^{\pm 1/2}]T^*_{c_4} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Take c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 as above. Since $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\lambda_2 n_w) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{v}_2) = 0$, we have $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(c_1) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(c_2) = 0$. Hence $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(c_3) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(c_4) = 0$. Since $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(a) = 0$, we have $\ell(ac_4) = \ell(a) + \ell(c_4)$ by (4) of the above lemma. Therefore,

$$E(\lambda n_w) \in \left(\sum_{\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(c)=0} C[q_s^{\pm 1/2}]T^*_{ac} \right) \cap \mathcal{H} = \sum_{\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(c)=0} C[q_s^{1/2}]T^*_{ac}$$

Take $d_c \in C[q_s^{1/2}]$ such that $E(\lambda n_w) = \sum_{\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(c)=0} d_c T^*_{ac}$. Since $E(\lambda n_w) = E(ab) \in T^*_{ab} + \sum_{\widetilde{w}<ab} C[q_s^{1/2}]T^*_{\widetilde{w}}$, $d_b = 1$ and if $d_c \neq 0$ and $c \neq b$, then $ac < ab$. We have $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(a) = 0$, hence $\ell(ac) = \ell(a) + \ell(c)$ and $\ell(ab) = \ell(a) + \ell(b)$ by (4) of the above lemma. Therefore $d_c \neq 0$ implies $c \leq b$. We have $E(\lambda n_w) \in T^*_a(T^*_b + \sum_{c<b} CT^*_c) = T^*_a(T_b + \sum_{c<b} CT_c)$ in $\mathcal{H} \otimes C$. We get (3) from (2).

We prove (4). It is sufficient to prove that the ideal generated by $\{T_{n_s} \mid s \in S_{\mathrm{aff},2}\}$ is equal to $\bigoplus_{\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w})>0} CT_{\widetilde{w}}$. Let I' be a such ideal. Then $I' \supset \bigoplus_{\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w})>0} CT_{\widetilde{w}}$ is obvious. For the reverse inclusion, we prove that $\bigoplus_{\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w})>0} CT_{\widetilde{w}}$ is an ideal.

Let $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}(1)$ such that $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w}) > 0$ and $\widetilde{v} \in \widetilde{W}(1)$. We prove $T_{\widetilde{w}}T_{\widetilde{v}} \in \bigoplus_{\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w}')>0} CT_{\widetilde{w}'}$. We may assume $\widetilde{v} = n_s$ for $s \in S_{\mathrm{aff}}$. If $\widetilde{w}n_s > \widetilde{w}$, then $T_{\widetilde{w}}T_{n_s} = T_{\widetilde{w}n_s}$ and $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w}n_s) = \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w}) + \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(n_s) > \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w}) > 0$. If $\widetilde{w}n_s < \widetilde{w}$, then $T_{\widetilde{w}}T_{n_s} = T_{\widetilde{w}}c_s$. □

Proof of Proposition 4.16. We prove

$$\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1} \otimes C \to (\mathcal{H} \otimes C)/I$$

is surjective and the kernel is $J \cap (\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1} \otimes C)$.

First we prove that the homomorphism is surjective. Let $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}(1)$. We prove that $T_{\widetilde{w}}$ is in the image. If $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w}) > 0$, then $T_{\widetilde{w}} \in I$. Hence we have nothing to prove. Assume that $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w}) = 0$. Since $T_{\widetilde{w}} \in E(\widetilde{w}) + \sum_{\widetilde{v}<\widetilde{w}} CE(\widetilde{v})$ and $\widetilde{v} < \widetilde{w}$ implies $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{v}) = 0$ by Lemma 4.17 (5), it is sufficient to prove that $E(\widetilde{w})$ is in the image. Take $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$, $w_1 \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}$ and $w_2 \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}$ such that $\widetilde{w} = \lambda n_{w_1} n_{w_2}$. Then we have

$$E(\widetilde{w}) = q^{1/2}_{\lambda n_{w_1} n_{w_2}} q^{-1/2}_{\lambda n_{w_1}} q^{-1/2}_{n_{w_2}} E(\lambda n_{w_1}) T_{n_{w_2}}.$$

By the assumption, we also have $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\lambda n_{w_1} n_{w_2}) = 0$. We have $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(n_{w_2}) = 0$. Hence by Lemma 4.17 (4), we have $\ell(\lambda n_{w_1}) = \ell(\lambda n_{w_1} n_{w_2}) + \ell(n^{-1}_{w_2}) = \ell(\lambda n_{w_1} n_{w_2}) + \ell(n_{w_2})$. Therefore we have $q_{\lambda n_{w_1}} = q_{\lambda n_{w_1} n_{w_2}} q_{n_{w_2}}$. Hence we get

$$E(\widetilde{w}) = q^{-1}_{n_{w_2}} E(\lambda n_{w_1}) T_{n_{w_2}}.$$

Therefore $E(\widetilde{w})T^*_{n^{-1}_{w_2}} = E(\lambda n_{w_1})$. Since $w_2 \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}$, $T^*_{n^{-1}_{w_2}} \in 1 + I$ by the above lemma (2). Hence $E(\widetilde{w}) \in E(\lambda n_{w_1}) + I$. By $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\lambda n_{w_1} n_{w_2}) = 0$ and Lemma 4.17 (6), $\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha \rangle = 0$ or 1 for $\alpha \in \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_2} = \Sigma^+ \setminus \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}$. In particular, λn_{w_1} is $\boldsymbol{M}_1$-negative. Hence $E(\widetilde{w})$ is in the image of the homomorphism.

The two-sided ideal J is generated by $\{E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda) - 1 \mid \lambda \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)\}$. If $\lambda \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)$, then $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda) = 0$. By Lemma 4.17 (7), $\widetilde{w}\lambda\widetilde{w}^{-1} \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)$ for $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)$ and in particular, we have $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}\lambda\widetilde{w}^{-1}) = 0$. Hence $E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w})E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\mu) = E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}\mu) = E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}\mu\widetilde{w}^{-1})E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w})$. Therefore $\sum_{\widetilde{w}\in\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1),\mu\in\Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)} C(E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\mu) - 1)E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}) = \sum_{\widetilde{w}\in\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1),\mu\in\Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)} C(E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\mu\widetilde{w}) - E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}))$ is a two-sided ideal and it is J. Hence if $\sum_{\widetilde{w}\in\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)} c_{\widetilde{w}} E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}) \in J$, then $\sum_{\mu\in\Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)} c_{\mu\widetilde{w}} = 0$ for any $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)$.

Assume that $\sum_{\widetilde{w}\in\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)} c_{\widetilde{w}} E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}) \in J$. For each $x \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)\setminus\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)$, fix a representative $\widetilde{w}(x) \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)$ which is $\boldsymbol{M}_1$-negative. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\widetilde{w}\in\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)} c_{\widetilde{w}} E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}) \\
&= \sum_{x\in\Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)\setminus\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)} \sum_{\mu\in\Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)} c_{\mu\widetilde{w}(x)}(E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\mu\widetilde{w}(x)) - E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}(x))).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $(\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}} \otimes C) \cap J$ is contained in the subspace generated by $\{E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}_1) - E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}_2) \mid \widetilde{w}_1\widetilde{w}_2^{-1} \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1),\ \widetilde{w}_1, \widetilde{w}_2 \text{ are } \boldsymbol{M}_1\text{-negative}\}$.

Let J' be the kernel of $\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1} \otimes C \to (\mathcal{H} \otimes C)/I$. We prove $J \cap (\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1} \otimes C) \subset J'$. By the above argument, to prove it, it is sufficient to prove that $E(\lambda_1 n_w) - E(\lambda_2 n_w) \in I$ if $\lambda_1 n_w, \lambda_2 n_w$ are $\boldsymbol{M}_1$-negative and $\lambda_1\lambda_2^{-1} \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)$.

Let $\mu \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)$ be a dominant element. By the length formula (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\ell(\mu\lambda n_w)\\ &= \sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+, w^{-1}(\alpha)>0} |\langle \nu(\mu), \alpha\rangle + \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle| + \sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+, w^{-1}(\alpha)<0} |\langle \nu(\mu), \alpha\rangle + \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle - 1|\end{aligned}$$

If $w^{-1}(\alpha) < 0$, then since $w \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}$, we have $\alpha \in \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}$. Since $\mu \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)$, we have $\langle \nu(\mu), \alpha\rangle = 0$. Therefore we have $|\langle \nu(\mu), \alpha\rangle + \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle - 1| = |\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle - 1| = |\langle \nu(\mu), \alpha\rangle| + |\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle - 1|$. If $w^{-1}(\alpha) > 0$ and $\alpha \in \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}$, then again we have $\langle \nu(\mu), \alpha\rangle = 0$. Hence $|\langle \nu(\mu), \alpha\rangle + \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle| = |\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle| = |\langle \nu(\mu), \alpha\rangle| + |\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle|$. If $\alpha \in \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}$ (hence $w^{-1}(\alpha) > 0$), we have $\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle \geq 0$ since λ is $\boldsymbol{M}_1$-negative. Since μ is dominant, we have $\langle \nu(\mu), \alpha\rangle \geq 0$. Hence $|\langle \nu(\mu), \alpha\rangle + \langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle| = |\langle \nu(\mu), \alpha\rangle| + |\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle|$. Therefore we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\ell(\mu\lambda n_w)\\ &= \sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+} |\langle \nu(\mu), \alpha\rangle| + \sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+, w^{-1}(\alpha)>0} |\langle \nu(\lambda)\alpha\rangle| + \sum_{\alpha\in\Sigma^+, w^{-1}(\alpha)<0} |\langle \nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle - 1|\\ &= \ell(\mu) + \ell(\lambda n_w).\end{aligned}$$

Hence $E(\mu\lambda n_w) = E(\mu)E(\lambda n_w)$. Since $E(\mu) = T^*_\mu \in 1 + I$ by Proposition 2.7 and the above lemma, we have $E(\mu\lambda n_w) - E(\lambda n_w) \in I$. Let λ_1, λ_2 be $\boldsymbol{M}_1$-negative elements such that $\lambda_1^{-1}\lambda_2 \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)$. Since $\Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)$ is normal in $\Lambda(1)$ by Lemma 4.17 (7), we also have $\lambda_2\lambda_1^{-1} \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)$. Take a dominant $\mu_0 \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)$ such that $\mu_0\lambda_2\lambda_1^{-1}$ is dominant. Then for $w \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&E(\lambda_1 n_w) - E(\lambda_2 n_w)\\ &= (E(\lambda_1 n_w) - E((\mu_0\lambda_2\lambda_1^{-1})\lambda_1 n_w)) + (E(\mu_0\lambda_2 n_w) - E(\lambda_2 n_w)) \in I\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we prove $J' \subset J \cap (\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1} \otimes C)$. Take $\sum_{\widetilde{w}\in\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)} c_{\widetilde{w}} E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}) \in J'$. Then for any $\widetilde{v} \in \widetilde{W}(1)$, we have $\sum_{\widetilde{w}\in\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)} c_{\widetilde{w}\widetilde{v}} E(\widetilde{w}\widetilde{v}) \in I$ by the above lemma (1). Hence we may assume $c_{\widetilde{w}} = 0$ if $\widetilde{w} \notin \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)\widetilde{v}$ for a fixed $\widetilde{v} \in \widetilde{W}(1)$. Since $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1) \supset \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)\Lambda(1) = \widetilde{W}(1)$, we may assume $\widetilde{v} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)$. Moreover, we may assume $\widetilde{v}$ is $\boldsymbol{M}_1$-negative. Take $\lambda' \in \Lambda(1)$ and $w' \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}$ such that $\widetilde{v} = \lambda' n_{w'}$. Let $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$, $w \in W$ such that $\lambda n_w \in \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)\widetilde{v}$. Then $\lambda' n_{w'} n_w^{-1}\lambda^{-1} \in \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)$. We have $\lambda' n_{w'} n_w^{-1}\lambda^{-1} = \lambda'\lambda^{-1}(\lambda n_{w'} n_w^{-1}\lambda^{-1})$ and $\lambda n_{w'} n_w^{-1}\lambda^{-1} \in \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)$ since $\widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1)$ is normal in $\widetilde{W}(1)$ (see subsection 2.1). Hence $\lambda'\lambda^{-1} \in \widetilde{W}_{\mathrm{aff}}(1) \cap \Lambda(1) = \Lambda'(1)$. By Lemma 2.5, we have $\Lambda'(1) = \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)\Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)$. Take $\lambda_1 \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)$ and $\lambda_2 \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)$ such that $\lambda'\lambda^{-1} = \lambda_1\lambda_2$. Since $\lambda_2 \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)$, we have $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda_2) = 0$. Hence $E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda n_w) - E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda_2\lambda n_w) = (1 - E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda_2))E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda n_w) \in J$. Moreover, since $\lambda_1 \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)$, we have $\langle \alpha, \nu(\lambda_1)\rangle = 0$ for any $\alpha \in \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}$. By the orthogonal decomposition $\Delta = \Delta_1 \amalg \Delta_2$, we have $\Sigma^+ \setminus \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_1} = \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}$. Hence for any $\alpha \in \Sigma^+ \setminus \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}$, $\langle \alpha, \nu(\lambda')\rangle = \langle \alpha, \nu(\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda)\rangle = \langle \alpha, \nu(\lambda_2\lambda)\rangle$. Therefore, since λ' is $\boldsymbol{M}_1$-negative, $\lambda_2\lambda$ is also $\boldsymbol{M}_1$-negative. Hence we have $E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda n_w) - E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda_2\lambda n_w) \in J \cap (\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1} \otimes C)$. Therefore, to prove $\sum_{\widetilde{w}\in\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)} c_{\widetilde{w}} E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}) \in J \cap (\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1} \otimes C)$, it is sufficient to prove that $\sum_{\widetilde{w}\in\widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)} c_{\widetilde{w}} E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\widetilde{w}) - c_{\lambda n_w}(E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda n_w) - E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda_2\lambda n_w)) \in J \cap (\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1} \otimes C)$. Notice that $\lambda'(\lambda_2\lambda)^{-1} = \lambda_1 \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)$. Therefore, we may assume

that $c_{\lambda n_w} \neq 0$ implies $\lambda'\lambda^{-1} \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)$. Or, equivalently, since $\Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)$ is normal in $\Lambda(1)$, we may assume $\lambda^{-1}\lambda' \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)$. Hence $(\lambda n_w)^{-1}\lambda' n_{w'} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1,\mathrm{aff}}(1)$. Take $a_0 \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_2,\mathrm{aff}}(1)$ and $b_0 \in \widetilde{W}(1)$ such that $\lambda' n_{w'} = a_0 b_0$ and $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(b_0) = 0$. If $c_{\lambda n_w} \neq 0$, then $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}((\lambda' n_{w'})^{-1}\lambda n_w) = 0$. Namely $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(b_0^{-1}a_0^{-1}\lambda n_w) = 0$. Since $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(b_0) = 0$, $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(a_0^{-1}\lambda n_w) = 0$.

Put $l = \max\{\ell(a_0^{-1}\lambda n_w) \mid c_{\lambda n_w} \neq 0\}$. We prove $\sum c_{\lambda n_w} E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda n_w) \in J \cap (\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1} \otimes C)$ by induction on l. We have $\sum c_{\lambda n_w} E(\lambda n_w) \in I$. By (3) of the above lemma, we have $E(\lambda n_w) \in T_{a_0^{-1}\lambda n_w} + \sum_{b<a_0^{-1}\lambda n_w} CT_b + I$. Hence

$$\sum_{\ell(a_0^{-1}\lambda n_w)=l} c_{\lambda n_w} T_{a_0^{-1}\lambda n_w} - \sum_{\ell(b)<l, \ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(b)=0} c_b T_b \in I$$

for some $c_b \in C$. The left hand side is in $\bigoplus_{\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(\widetilde{w})=0} CT_{\widetilde{w}}$. Hence it is contained in the ideal I_0 generated by $\{T_t - 1 \mid t \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1) \cap Z_\kappa\}$ by the above lemma (4). The ideal I_0 satisfies $I_0 = \bigoplus_{n\geq 0}\left(\bigoplus_{\ell(w)=n} CT_w \cap I_0\right)$. Hence we have $\sum_{\ell(a_0^{-1}\lambda n_w)=l} c_{\lambda n_w} T_{a_0^{-1}\lambda n_w} \in I_0$. Therefore, if $\ell(a_0^{-1}\lambda n_w) = l$, then we have $\sum_{t\in\Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)\cap Z_\kappa} c_{t\lambda n_w} = 0$. Set $X = \{\lambda n_w \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1) \mid \ell(a_0^{-1}\lambda n_w) = l\}$ and $Y = (\Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1) \cap Z_\kappa)\backslash X$. For each $y \in Y$ fix a representative $x(y) \in X$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\ell(a_0^{-1}\lambda n_w)=l} c_{\lambda n_w} E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda n_w) \\
&= \sum_{y\in Y} \sum_{t\in\Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)\cap Z_\kappa} c_{tx(y)}(E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(tx(y)) - E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(x(y))) \\
&= \sum_{y\in Y} \sum_{t\in\Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}_2}(1)\cap Z_\kappa} c_{tx(y)}(T_t^{\boldsymbol{M}_1} - 1)E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(x(y)) \in I_0 \subset J.
\end{aligned}$$

Since we have proved $J \cap \mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1} \otimes C \subset J'$, we have $\sum_{\ell(a_0^{-1}\lambda n_w)=l} c_{\lambda n_w} E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda n_w) \in J'$. Therefore $\sum_{\ell(a_0^{-1}\lambda n_w)<l} c_{\lambda n_w} E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda n_w) \in J'$. By inductive hypothesis, we have $\sum_{\ell(a_0^{-1}\lambda n_w)<l} c_{\lambda n_w} E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda n_w) \in J \cap \mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1} \otimes C$. Hence we have $\sum c_{\lambda n_w} E^{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(\lambda n_w) \in J \cap \mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}_1} \otimes C$. □

Proposition 4.19. *Let $\boldsymbol{P} = \boldsymbol{MN}$ be a parabolic subgroup such that $\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}} \supset \Delta_1$ and σ as in Proposition 4.16. Denote the extension of σ to $\mathcal{H}$ (resp. $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$) by $e(\sigma)$ (resp. $e_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\sigma)$). Then $e(\sigma)|_{\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}} \simeq e_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\sigma)|_{\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}}$.*

Proof. Let $\widetilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(1)$ be a $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative element and we prove $e_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\sigma)(T^{\boldsymbol{M},*}_{\widetilde{w}}) = e(\sigma)(T^*_{\widetilde{w}})$. Let $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$, $w_1 \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}$ and $w_2 \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}_2} \cap W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ such that $\widetilde{w} = \lambda n_{w_1} n_{w_2}$. First we prove that $e(\sigma)(T^*_{\widetilde{w}}) = e(\sigma)(T^*_{\lambda n_{w_1}})$ by induction on $\ell(w_2)$. Take $s \in S_2$ such that $w_2 s < w_2$. If $\lambda n_{w_1} n_{w_2} n_s > \lambda n_{w_1} n_{w_2}$, then $T^*_{\lambda n_{w_1} n_{w_2}} T^*_{n_s^{-1}} = T^*_{\lambda n_{w_1} n_{w_2 s}}$. If $\lambda n_{w_1} n_{w_2} n_s < \lambda n_{w_1} n_{w_2}$, then $T^*_{\lambda n_{w_1} n_{w_2}} = T^*_{\lambda n_{w_1} n_{w_2 s}} T^*_{n_s}$. By Lemma 4.18 (2), we have $e(\sigma)(T^*_{n_s}) = e(\sigma)(T^*_{n_s^{-1}}) = 1$. Hence in any case, we have $e(\sigma)(T^*_{\lambda n_{w_1} n_{w_2}}) = e(\sigma)(T^*_{\lambda n_{w_1} n_{w_2 s}})$. It completes the induction. From the same argument, we have $e_{\boldsymbol{M}}(T^{\boldsymbol{M},*}_{\widetilde{w}}) = e_{\boldsymbol{M}}(T^{\boldsymbol{M},*}_{\lambda n_{w_1}})$.

Let $\boldsymbol{M}'_2$ be the Levi part of the parabolic subgroup corresponding to $\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}} \cap \Delta_2$. Take $\mu \in \Lambda'_{\boldsymbol{M}'_2}(1)$ such that $\langle \alpha, \nu(\mu)\rangle$ is sufficiently large for $\alpha \in \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}'_2}$. Since $\widetilde{w}$ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative, $\langle \alpha, \nu(\lambda)\rangle \geq 0$ for $\alpha \in \Sigma^+ \setminus \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_2} \setminus \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}'_2}$. Hence we can take μ such that $\langle \alpha, \nu(\mu\lambda)\rangle \geq 0$ for any $\alpha \in \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_2} = \Sigma^+ \setminus \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}$, namely $\mu\lambda n_{w_1}$ is $\boldsymbol{M}_1$-negative. The element μ is in $W_{\boldsymbol{M}'_2,\mathrm{aff}}(1)$. Hence using the same argument in the

above, we have $e_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\sigma)(T^{\boldsymbol{M},*}_{\lambda n_{w_1}}) = e_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\sigma)(T^{\boldsymbol{M},*}_{\mu\lambda n_{w_1}})$. Since μ is also in $W_{\boldsymbol{M}_2,\mathrm{aff}}(1)$, we have $e(\sigma)(T^*_{\lambda n_{w_1}}) = e(\sigma)(T^*_{\mu\lambda n_{w_1}})$. Finally, since $\mu\lambda n_{w_1} \in W_{\boldsymbol{M}_1}(1)$ is $\boldsymbol{M}_1$-negative, we have $e_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\sigma)(T^{\boldsymbol{M},*}_{\mu\lambda n_{w_1}}) = \sigma(T^{\boldsymbol{M}_1,*}_{\mu\lambda n_{w_1}}) = e(\sigma)(T^*_{\mu\lambda n_{w_1}})$. □

4.5. **Statement of the classification theorem.** We begin with the definition of supersingular representations.

Definition 4.20 ([Oll12, Proposition-Definition 5.9], [Vigb, Definition 6.10])**.** For each adjoint $\widetilde{W}(1)$-orbit $\mathcal{O}$ in $\Lambda(1)$, put $z_{\mathcal{O}} = \sum_{\lambda\in\mathcal{O}} E(\lambda)$. Let $\mathcal{J}$ be the ideal generated by $\{z_{\mathcal{O}} \mid \ell(\lambda) > 0\ (\lambda \in \mathcal{O})\}$. An $\mathcal{H}$-module π is called *supersingular* if there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $\mathcal{J}^n\pi = 0$.

Notice that $\ell(\lambda)$ is independent of $\lambda \in \mathcal{O}$. By [Vig14, Theorem 1.2], $z_{\mathcal{O}}$ is in the center of $\mathcal{H}$. We mainly use the characterization (3) and (4) in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.21. *Let π be an irreducible $\mathcal{H}\otimes C$-module and $\mathcal{J}$ as in Definition 4.20. Then the following are equivalent.*

(1) *The module π is supersingular.*
(2) *We have $\mathcal{J}\pi = 0$.*
(3) *For any irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-submodule X of π, $\operatorname{supp} X = \Lambda_\Delta(1)$.*
(4) *There exists an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-submodule X of π such that $\operatorname{supp} X = \Lambda_\Delta(1)$.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{J}\pi$ is $\mathcal{H}$-stable, the equivalence between (1) and (2) is clear. Obviously, (3) implies (4).

Notice that $\Lambda_\Delta(1) = \Lambda^+_\Delta(1)$. Recall that $\operatorname{supp} X = \Lambda_\Delta(1)$ if and only if the action of $\mathcal{A}$ on X factors through χ_Δ. Let X be an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-submodule of π. We prove $\mathcal{J}X = 0$ if and only if $\operatorname{supp} X = \Lambda_\Delta(1)$. Let $\Theta \subset \Delta$ and $w \in W$ such that the action of $\mathcal{A}$ on X factors through $w\chi_\Theta$. By the length formula (2.1), $\ell(\lambda) = 0$ if and only if $\langle\nu(\lambda), \alpha\rangle = 0$ for any $\alpha \in \Sigma^+$, namely $\lambda \in \Lambda_\Delta(1)$. Hence if $\ell(\lambda) > 0$, then $\chi_\Delta(E(\lambda)) = 0$. Therefore, if $\Theta = \Delta$, then $\mathcal{J}X = 0$.

Assume that $\Theta \neq \Delta$. We take $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$ as follows. Fix a uniformizer ϖ of F and consider the embedding $X_*(\boldsymbol{S}) \hookrightarrow \boldsymbol{S}(F)$ defined by $\lambda \mapsto \lambda(\varpi)^{-1}$. Then composition $X_*(\boldsymbol{S}) \hookrightarrow \boldsymbol{S}(F) \hookrightarrow \boldsymbol{Z}(F) \to \Lambda(1) \xrightarrow{\nu} V$ is equal to the embedding $X_*(\boldsymbol{S}) \hookrightarrow V$ and in particular it is injective. Take $\lambda_0 \in X_*(\boldsymbol{S})$ such that its image λ in $\Lambda(1)$ satisfies $w\chi_\Theta(E(\lambda)) \neq 0$ and $\ell(\lambda) > 0$. Since $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{S}(F)$ and $\boldsymbol{S}(F)$ is contained in the center of $\boldsymbol{Z}(F)$, λ commutes with an element of $\Lambda(1)$. Hence the orbit $\mathcal{O}$ through λ is $\{n_w(\lambda) \mid w \in W\}$. Moreover, if $w \in W$ satisfies $\nu(n_w(\lambda)) = n_w(\lambda)$, then we have $w(\lambda_0) = \lambda_0$. Hence $n_w(\lambda) = \lambda$. Therefore $\mathcal{O} = \{n_w(\lambda) \mid w \in W/\operatorname{Stab}_W(\nu(\lambda))\}$. Since $w\chi_\Theta(E(\lambda)) \neq 0$, $w^{-1}(\nu(\lambda))$ is dominant. Hence, if $v \in W$ does not stabilize $\nu(\lambda)$, then $w^{-1}v^{-1}(\nu(\lambda))$ is not dominant. Therefore we have $w\chi_\Theta(E(n_v(\lambda))) = 0$. Hence $w\chi_\Theta(z_{\mathcal{O}}) = \sum_{v\in W/\operatorname{Stab}(\nu(\lambda))} w\chi_\Theta(E(n_v(\lambda))) = w\chi_\Theta(E(\lambda))$ and it is invertible. Therefore $\mathcal{J}X \neq 0$.

We assume that π is supersingular. Let X be an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-submodule. Then $\mathcal{J}X \subset \mathcal{J}\pi = 0$. Hence we have $\operatorname{supp} X = \Lambda_\Delta(1)$. Thereofre (2) implies (3). Assume that there exists an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-submodule X such that $\operatorname{supp} X = \Lambda_\Delta(1)$. Then $\mathcal{J}X = 0$. Hence $\{x \in \pi \mid \mathcal{J}x = 0\} \neq 0$. Since the left hand side is $\mathcal{H}$-stable, $\{x \in \pi \mid \mathcal{J}x = 0\} = \pi$. Therefore $\mathcal{J}\pi = 0$. Hence (4) implies (2). □

Let $\boldsymbol{P} = \boldsymbol{MN}$ be a standard parabolic subgroup and σ an irreducible supersingular representation of $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Define

$$\Delta(\sigma) = \{\alpha \in \Delta \mid \langle\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}, \check{\alpha}\rangle = 0, \sigma(E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda)) = 1 \text{ for any } \lambda \in \Lambda'_{s_\alpha}(1)\} \cup \Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}.$$

Notice that if $\langle\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}, \check{\alpha}\rangle = 0$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda'_{s_\alpha}(1)$, then $\langle\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}, \nu(\lambda)\rangle = 0$ by Lemma 2.3. Hence $\ell_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda) = 0$. Therefore we have $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda) = T^{\boldsymbol{M}}_\lambda$.

Let $\boldsymbol{P}(\sigma) = \boldsymbol{M}(\sigma)\boldsymbol{N}(\sigma)$ be the parabolic subgroup corresponding to $\Delta(\sigma)$. Let $\boldsymbol{Q}$ be a parabolic subgroup such that $\boldsymbol{P}(\sigma) \supset \boldsymbol{Q} \supset \boldsymbol{P}$. By Proposition 4.16, we have the extension $e_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\sigma)$ of σ to $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{Q}}$. By Proposition 4.19, if $\boldsymbol{Q}' \supset \boldsymbol{Q}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}(e_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}(\sigma)) &= \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}}(\mathcal{H}, e_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}(\sigma)|_{\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}}) \\ &\subset \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}(\mathcal{H}, e_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}(\sigma)|_{\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}) \\ &= \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}(\mathcal{H}, e_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\sigma)|_{\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}) = I_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(e_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\sigma)). \end{aligned}$$

Define an $\mathcal{H}$-module $I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q})$ by

$$I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q}) = I_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(e_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\sigma)) \Big/ \left(\sum_{\boldsymbol{P}(\sigma) \supset \boldsymbol{Q}' \supsetneq \boldsymbol{Q}} I_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}(e_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}(\sigma)) \right)$$

The main theorem of this paper is the following.

Theorem 4.22. *For any triple $(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q})$, $I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q})$ is irreducible and any irreducible $\mathcal{H}$-module have this form. Moreover, $I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q}) \simeq I(\boldsymbol{P}', \sigma', \boldsymbol{Q}')$ implies $\boldsymbol{P} = \boldsymbol{P}'$, $\sigma \simeq \sigma'$ and $\boldsymbol{Q} = \boldsymbol{Q}'$.*

4.6. **Irreducibility.** We prove that $I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q})$ is irreducible.

Lemma 4.23. *The isomorphism $I_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(e_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\sigma)) \simeq \bigoplus_{w \in W^{\boldsymbol{Q}}} w\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ induces $I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q}) \simeq \bigoplus_{\Delta_w \cap \Delta(\sigma) = \Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}} w\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. We remark that $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} = e_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\sigma)_{\mathcal{A}}$. Indeed, if $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative, then $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(E(\lambda)) = \sigma(E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda)) = e_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\sigma)(E^{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\lambda))$ by the definition of $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ and the extension. Since λ is also $\boldsymbol{Q}$-negative, we have $e_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\sigma)(E^{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\lambda)) = e_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\sigma)_{\mathcal{A}}(E(\lambda))$. If λ is not $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative, take $\lambda_0^- \in \Lambda(1)$ as in Remark 4.7. Then the above calculation shows $e_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\sigma)_{\mathcal{A}}(E(\lambda_0^-)) = \sigma(E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda_0^-))$ and it is invertible. On the other hand, since λ is not $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative, $\nu(\lambda)$ and $\nu(\lambda_0^-)$ do not belong to the same closed chamber. Hence $E(\lambda)E(\lambda_0^-) = 0$ by (3.1). Therefore we have $e_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\sigma)_{\mathcal{A}}(E(\lambda)) = e_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\sigma)_{\mathcal{A}}(E(\lambda)E(\lambda_0^-))e_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\sigma)_{\mathcal{A}}(E(\lambda_0^-))^{-1} = 0$. By the definition of $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$, we have $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(E(\lambda)) = 0$. Hence we get $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} = e_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\sigma)_{\mathcal{A}}$.

For $\boldsymbol{P}(\sigma) \supset \boldsymbol{Q}' \supset \boldsymbol{Q}$, we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}(e_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}(\sigma)) & \hookrightarrow & I_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(e_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\sigma)) \\ \wr\downarrow & & \wr\downarrow \\ \displaystyle\bigoplus_{w \in W^{\boldsymbol{Q}'}} w\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} & \hookrightarrow & \displaystyle\bigoplus_{w \in W^{\boldsymbol{Q}}} w\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}. \end{array}$$

We write the low horizontal map explicitly. If $\varphi \in I_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}(e_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}(\sigma))$, then its image in $\bigoplus_{w \in W^{\boldsymbol{Q}}} w\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} \simeq I_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(e_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\sigma))$ is $(\varphi(T_{n_w}))_{w \in W^{\boldsymbol{Q}}}$. Let $w \in W$ and decompose $w = w_1 w_2$ such that $w_1 \in W^{\boldsymbol{Q}'}$ and $w_2 \in W_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}$. Then we have $(\varphi(T_{n_w})) = (\varphi(T_{n_{w_1}} T_{n_{w_2}})) = (\varphi(T_{n_{w_1}})T_{n_{w_2}})$. Hence the low horizontal map of the above diagram is given by $(x_w)_{w \in W^{\boldsymbol{Q}'}} \mapsto (x_{w_1} T_{n_{w_2}})_{w_1 w_2}$. For $\alpha \in \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{Q}} \subset \Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}$, $w_2(\alpha) \in \Sigma_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}$. Hence $w_1 w_2(\alpha) > 0$ if and only if $w_2(\alpha) > 0$. Therefore, $w_1 w_2 \in W^{\boldsymbol{Q}}$ if and only if $w_2 \in W^{\boldsymbol{Q}}$.

We have $w_2 \in W_{\boldsymbol{Q}'} \cap W^{\boldsymbol{Q}} \subset W_{\boldsymbol{Q}'} \cap W^{\boldsymbol{P}}$. Since we have the orthogonal decomposition $\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}'} = \Delta_{\boldsymbol{P}} \cup (\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}'} \setminus \Delta_{\boldsymbol{P}})$, the group $W_{\boldsymbol{Q}'} \cap W^{\boldsymbol{P}}$ is generated by $\{s_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}'} \setminus \Delta_{\boldsymbol{P}}\}$. For such α, $T_{n_{s_\alpha}} = 0$ on $e_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}(\sigma)$ by the definition of the extension. Therefore, $x_{w_1} T_{n_{w_2}} = 0$ if $w_2 \neq 1$. Hence the low horizontal map of the above diagram is the inclusion map induced by $W^{\boldsymbol{Q}'} \hookrightarrow W^{\boldsymbol{Q}}$. Therefore we

have

$$I(\boldsymbol{P},\sigma,\boldsymbol{Q})=\bigoplus_{w} w\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$$

where w runs in $W^{\boldsymbol{Q}}$ such that $w\notin W^{\boldsymbol{Q}'}$ for any $\boldsymbol{P}(\sigma)\supset\boldsymbol{Q}'\supsetneq\boldsymbol{Q}$. Notice that $w\in W^{\boldsymbol{Q}}$ if and only if $\Delta_w\supset\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}$ by the definition. Hence $w\in W^{\boldsymbol{Q}}$ and $w\notin W^{\boldsymbol{Q}'}$ for any $\boldsymbol{P}(\sigma)\supset\boldsymbol{Q}'\supsetneq\boldsymbol{Q}$ is equivalent to $\Delta_w\supset\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}$ and $\alpha\notin\Delta_w$ for any $\alpha\in\Delta(\sigma)\setminus\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}$ which is equivalent to $\Delta_w\cap\Delta(\sigma)=\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}$. □

We use the notation $\Delta(X)$ from Corollary 3.17.

Lemma 4.24. *Let X be an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-submodule of $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$. Then* $\operatorname{supp}X=\Lambda^{+}_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}(1)$ *and* $\Delta(X)=\Delta(\sigma)$.

Proof. Take $\lambda_0^-\in\Lambda(1)$ as in Remark 4.7. Then $\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{M}}=(\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{M}}\cap\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}})E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda_0^-)^{-1}$ by the argument in Remark 4.7. Put $X'=X\sigma(\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{M}})=\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}X\sigma(E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda_0^-)^{-n})$. We prove that X' is an irreducible $\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$-module. Take $x\in X'\setminus\{0\}$. Then by multiplying the power of $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda_0^-)$, we have $X\cap x\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{M}}\neq 0$. Since X is an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-module, we have $X\subset(X\cap x\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{M}})\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A})$. The definition of $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ tells that $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A})=\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}\cap\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}})=\sigma(\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{M}}\cap\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}})$. Hence $X\subset(X\cap x\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{M}})\sigma(\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{M}}\cap\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}})\subset x\sigma(\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{M}})$. Hence $X'=x\sigma(\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{M}})$. We get the irreducibility of X'.

Since σ is supersingular, $\operatorname{supp}X'=\Lambda_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}(1)$. Recall that if λ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative, then the action of $E(\lambda)$ on $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the action of $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda)$ on σ. Hence for $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative λ, we have $\lambda\in\operatorname{supp}X$ if and only if $\lambda\in\Lambda_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}(1)$. By the definition of $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$, if λ is not $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative then $\lambda\notin\operatorname{supp}X$. Hence λ is in $\operatorname{supp}X$ if and only if λ is $\boldsymbol{M}$-negative and $\lambda\in\Lambda_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}(1)$. Namely we have $\operatorname{supp}X=\Lambda^{+}_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}(1)$.

Hence X is a $C[\Lambda_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}(1)]$-module. Assume that $\langle\alpha,\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}\rangle=0$. Then for $\lambda\in\Lambda'_{s_\alpha}(1)$, we have $\langle\nu(\lambda),\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}\rangle=0$. Namely, $\lambda\in\Lambda_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}(1)$. Take $\lambda_1,\lambda_2\in\Lambda^{+}_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}(1)$ such that $\lambda=\lambda_1\lambda_2^{-1}$. Then the action of τ_{λ_1} is equal to that of $E(\lambda_1)$ and, it is also equal to the action of $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda_1)$ on $X\subset\sigma$. It is also true if we replace λ_1 with λ_2. Since $\tau_\lambda=\tau_{\lambda_1}\tau_{\lambda_2}^{-1}$ and $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda)=E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda_1)E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda_2)^{-1}$, the action of τ_λ on X and $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda)$ on $X\subset\sigma$ coincide with each other. If $\alpha\in\Delta(\sigma)$, then $E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda)$ is trivial on σ for any $\lambda\in\Lambda'_{s_\alpha}(1)$. Hence τ_λ is trivial on X, namely $\alpha\in\Delta(X)$. Conversely, assume that $\alpha\in\Delta(X)$. Then $\{x\in\sigma\mid xE^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda)=x\ (\lambda\in\Lambda'_{s_\alpha}(1))\}\supset X$. In particular it is not zero. On the other hand, this subspace is stable under the action of $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Hence this space is σ. Therefore $\alpha\in\Delta(\sigma)$. □

Lemma 4.25. *There exists $\lambda\in n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}}(\Lambda^{+}_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}(1))$ such that $w\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(E(\lambda))=0$ for any $w\in W^{\boldsymbol{Q}}\setminus\{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}\}$. In particular, if X is an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-submodule of $I(\boldsymbol{P},\sigma,\boldsymbol{Q})$ such that* $\operatorname{supp}X=n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}}(\Lambda^{+}_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}(1))$, *then we have $X\subset w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}\sigma$.*

Proof. First we prove the following claim.

Claim. If $w\in W^{\boldsymbol{Q}}\setminus\{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}\}$, then $(\Sigma^-\setminus\Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{Q}})\cap(w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}})^{-1}w(\Sigma^+\setminus\Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{Q}})\neq\emptyset$.

Set $\boldsymbol{Q}'=n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}}\boldsymbol{Q}(n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}})^{-1}$ and $v=w(w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}})^{-1}$. Then we have $\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}=-w_\Delta(\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}})=w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}(\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}})$. Hence $v(\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}'})=w(\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}})\subset\Sigma^+$. Therefore $v\in W^{\boldsymbol{Q}'}$. We also have $v\neq 1$, hence $v\notin W_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}$. Therefore $v^{-1}\notin W_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}$. Hence there exists $\alpha\in\Sigma^+\setminus\Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}$ such that $v^{-1}(\alpha)<0$. If $v^{-1}(\alpha)\in\Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}$, then $\alpha=v(v^{-1}(\alpha))\in v(\Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{Q}'})\subset\Sigma^-$, this is a contradiction. Hence $v^{-1}(\alpha)\in\Sigma^-\setminus\Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}$. Namely $\alpha\in v(\Sigma^-\setminus\Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{Q}'})\cap(\Sigma^+\setminus\Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{Q}'})$. By the definition of v and $\Sigma^{\mp}\setminus\Sigma^{\mp}_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}=w_\Delta(\Sigma^{\pm}\setminus\Sigma^{\pm}_{\boldsymbol{Q}})=w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}(\Sigma^{\pm}\setminus\Sigma^{\pm}_{\boldsymbol{Q}})$, we get $\alpha\in w(\Sigma^+\setminus\Sigma^+_{\boldsymbol{Q}})\cap w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}(\Sigma^-\setminus\Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{Q}})$. Hence $(w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}})^{-1}(\alpha)$ gives an element in the intersection of the claim.

Take $\lambda_0^-\in\Lambda^{+}_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}(1)$ as in Remark 4.7 and set $\lambda=n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}}(\lambda_0^-)$. We have $\lambda\in n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}}(\Lambda^{+}_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}(1))$. Let $w\in W^{\boldsymbol{Q}}\setminus\{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}\}$. Take α from the intersection

in the claim. Then since $\alpha \in \Sigma^- \setminus \Sigma^-_{\boldsymbol{Q}}$, we have $\langle w^{-1}w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}(\alpha), \nu(n_w^{-1}(\lambda))\rangle = \langle \alpha, \nu(\lambda_0^-)\rangle < 0$. Therefore $n_w^{-1}(\lambda)$ is not $\boldsymbol{Q}$-negative. Hence $(w\sigma_{\mathcal{A}})(E(\lambda)) = 0$.

Assume that X is an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-submodule of $I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q})$ such that $\operatorname{supp} X = n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}}(\Lambda^+_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}(1))$. Take λ as in the above and $x \in X \setminus \{0\}$. Let $x_w \in w\sigma$ such that $x = \sum x_w$. Since $\lambda \in \operatorname{supp} X$, $E(\lambda)$ is invertible on X. Hence $0 \neq xE(\lambda) = \sum x_w E(\lambda) = x_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}} E(\lambda)$. Therefore $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}\sigma \cap X$ is a non-zero $\mathcal{A}$-submodule of X. Since X is irreducible, we have $X \subset w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}\sigma$. □

We prove that $I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q})$ is irreducible. Let $\pi \subset I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q})$ be a non-zero $\mathcal{H}$-submodule and take an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-submodule X' of π. By Lemma 4.23, we have the decomposition $I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q}) = \bigoplus_{\Delta_w \cap \Delta(\sigma) = \Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}} w\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$. Take w such that the composition $X' \hookrightarrow I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q}) = \bigoplus_{\Delta_w \cap \Delta(\sigma) = \Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}} w\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} \twoheadrightarrow w\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ is non-zero. Then we have $X' \hookrightarrow w\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$. Such irreducible representation has a form wX for an irreducible submodule X of $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$. Hence we get a non-zero homomorphism $wX \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \to \pi$. By Lemma 4.24 and Corollary 3.17, if $\Delta_{w'} \cap \Delta(\sigma) = \Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}$, then $wX \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \simeq w'X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$. Hence we have a non-zero homomorphism $w'X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \to \pi$, which gives a non-zero $\mathcal{A}$-homomorphism $w'X \to \pi$. In particular we have $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}} X \hookrightarrow \pi$. By Lemma 4.25, the image of $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}} X \hookrightarrow \pi \hookrightarrow I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q})$ is contained in $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}\sigma$. Therefore we have $\pi \cap w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}\sigma \neq 0$. By Proposition 4.14, we have $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}\sigma \subset \pi$. Put $\sigma' = w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}\sigma$. Let $\boldsymbol{Q}'$ be a parabolic subgroup corresponding to $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}(\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}})$. By Proposition 4.14, σ' is $\mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}$-stable and we have a homomorphism $\sigma' \otimes_{\mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}} \mathcal{H} \to \pi$. By the construction, we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \sigma' \otimes_{\mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}} \mathcal{H} & \longrightarrow & I_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(e_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\sigma)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow\!\!\downarrow \\ \pi & \hookrightarrow & I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q}). \end{array}$$

Here $\sigma' \otimes_{\mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}} \mathcal{H} \to I_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(e_{\boldsymbol{Q}}(\sigma))$ is a homomorphism in Proposition 4.15. Hence it is an isomorphism. Therefore $\pi = I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q})$.

Corollary 4.26. *Let $\boldsymbol{P} = \boldsymbol{MN}$ be a parabolic subgroup and σ an irreducible supersingular $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$-module. Then the composition factors of $I_{\boldsymbol{P}}(\sigma)$ is given by $\{I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q}) \mid \boldsymbol{P}(\sigma) \supset \boldsymbol{Q} \supset \boldsymbol{P}\}$.*

Remark 4.27. After finishing the proof of Theorem 4.22, we know that $I_{\boldsymbol{P}}(\sigma)$ is multiplicity free.

4.7. **Completion of the proof.** We finish the proof of Theorem 4.22. First we prove that any irreducible $\mathcal{H}$-module π is isomorphic to $I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q})$ by induction on $\dim \boldsymbol{G}$. By Corollary 4.26, it is sufficient to prove that π is a subquotient of $I_{\boldsymbol{P}}(\sigma)$ for a parabolic subgroup $\boldsymbol{P} = \boldsymbol{MN}$ and a supsersingular irreducible representation σ of $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. We use the following lemma. This is a generalization of a conjecture of Ollivier [Oll10, Conjecture 5.20].

Lemma 4.28. *Let X be an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-module and $\Theta \subset \Delta$ such that $\operatorname{supp} X = \Lambda^+_\Theta(1)$. Let $w, w' \in W$ such that $w(\Theta), w'(\Theta) \subset \Sigma^+$. Then $wX \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ and $w'X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ have the same composition factors with multiplicities.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.13, we may assume $w = w_\Delta w_{\Theta_0}$ and $w' = ws_\alpha$ for $\Theta_0 \subset \Delta$ and $\alpha \in \Theta_0$ such that $\Theta_0 \subset \Theta$. By Corollary 3.17, we may assume $\alpha \in \Delta(X)$. Take $x \in V^*$ such that $x(\nu(\Lambda(1))) \subset \mathbb{Z}$ and $\langle x, \check{\alpha}\rangle \neq 0$. Consider an algebra homomorphism $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)] \to C[t^{\pm 1}]$ defined by $\tau_\lambda \mapsto t^{\langle x, \nu(\lambda)\rangle}$. Both X and $C[t^{\pm 1}]$ are representations of $\Lambda_\Theta(1)$. Hence we have a representation $X[t^{\pm 1}] = X \otimes C[t^{\pm 1}]$ of $\Lambda_\Theta(1)$, equivalently $C[\Lambda_\Theta(1)]$-module. Via χ_Θ, we get an $\mathcal{A}$-module $X[t^{\pm 1}]$.

Consider the $\mathcal{H}$-module $wX[t^{\pm 1}] \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ and $w'X[t^{\pm 1}] \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$. By Proposition 3.8, these modules are free $C[t^{\pm 1}]$-modules. From the proof of Corollary 3.17, we have injective homomorphisms $wX[t^{\pm 1}] \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \to w'X[t^{\pm 1}] \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ and $w'X[t^{\pm 1}] \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \to wX[t^{\pm 1}] \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$. The compositions are given by $1 - t^{\langle x, -\check{\alpha} \rangle}$. By [BL95, Lemma 31], we get the lemma. □

Let π be an irreducible representation of $\mathcal{H}$ and take an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-submodule X'. Then there exists $\Theta \subset \Delta$ and $w \in W$ such that $\operatorname{supp} X' = n_w(\Lambda^+_\Theta(1))$ and $w(\Theta) > 0$. Take an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-module X such that $X' = wX$. Then $\operatorname{supp} X = \Lambda^+_\Theta(1)$. Since we have $wX = X' \hookrightarrow \pi$, we have a non-zero homomorphism $wX \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \to \pi$. Therefore π is a quotient of $wX \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$. Taking $w' = 1$ in the above lemma, the composition factors of $wX \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ and $X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ is the same. Hence π is a subquotient of $X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$.

If $\Theta = \Delta$, then π is supersingular. So we have nothing to prove. We assume that $\Theta \neq \Delta$. Let $\boldsymbol{P}' = \boldsymbol{M}'\boldsymbol{N}'$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{P} = \boldsymbol{M}\boldsymbol{N}$) be the parabolic subgroup corresponding to Θ (resp. $-w_\Delta(\Theta)$).

Lemma 4.29. *Put $\mathcal{A}' = \mathcal{A} \cap j^+_{\boldsymbol{M}'}(\mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}'})$. Then $X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \simeq X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}'} \mathcal{H}$ and $X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}'} \mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}'}$ is the restriction of an $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}'}$-module.*

Proof. We have a natural homomorphism $X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}'} \mathcal{H} \to X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$. Take $\lambda^+_0 \in \Lambda(1)$ as in Remark 4.7 for $\boldsymbol{M}'$. Then we have $\lambda^+_0 \in \Lambda_\Theta(1)$. Hence $E(\lambda^+_0)$ is invertible on X. If $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$ is not $\boldsymbol{M}'$-positive, then $\nu(\lambda)$ and $\nu(\lambda^+_0)$ does not belong to the same closed Weyl chamber, hence $E(\lambda^+_0)E(\lambda) = 0$. Hence $x \otimes E(\lambda)F = xE(\lambda^+_0)^{-1} \otimes E(\lambda^+_0)E(\lambda)F = 0$ in $X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}'} \mathcal{H}$ for $x \in X$ and $F \in \mathcal{H}$. Therefore $x \otimes E(\lambda)F = 0 = xE(\lambda) \otimes F$. Hence $X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}'} \mathcal{H} \to X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ is an isomorphism.

The element $E^{\boldsymbol{M}'}(\lambda^+_0)$ is in the center of $\mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}'}$ and $j^+_{\boldsymbol{M}'}(E^{\boldsymbol{M}'}(\lambda^+_0)) = E(\lambda^+_0) \in \mathcal{A}'$ is invertible on X. Hence $E^{\boldsymbol{M}'}(\lambda^+_0)$ is invertible on $X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}'} \mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}'}$. Since $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}'} = \mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}'} E^{\boldsymbol{M}'}(\lambda^+_0)^{-1}$ by Remark 4.7, we have $X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}'} \mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}'} \simeq (X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}'} \mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}'}) E^{\boldsymbol{M}}(\lambda^+_0)^{-1} \simeq X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}'} \mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}'}$. □

Hence we have $X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H} \simeq (X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}'} \mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}'}) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}'}} \mathcal{H}$. By Proposition 4.15, π is an subquotient of $I_{\boldsymbol{P}}(\sigma)$ for an $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$-module σ. (Explicitly, σ is given by $X \otimes_{\mathcal{A}'} \mathcal{H}^+_{\boldsymbol{M}'}$ twisting by $n_{w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}}$.) Hence for some irreducible subquotient σ' of σ, π is a subquotient of $I_{\boldsymbol{P}}(\sigma')$. By inductive hypothesis, σ' is a subquotient of $I_{\boldsymbol{P}_0 \cap \boldsymbol{M}}(\sigma_0)$ where $\boldsymbol{P}_0 = \boldsymbol{M}_0\boldsymbol{N}_0 \subset \boldsymbol{P}$ is a parabolic subgroup of $\boldsymbol{G}$ and σ_0 is a supersingular $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}$-module. Hence π is a subquotient of $I_{\boldsymbol{P}_0}(\sigma_0)$.

Finally, we prove that $I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q}) \simeq I(\boldsymbol{P}', \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q}')$ implies $\boldsymbol{P} = \boldsymbol{P}'$, $\boldsymbol{Q} = \boldsymbol{Q}'$ and $\sigma \simeq \sigma'$. Let $\boldsymbol{M}$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{M}'$) be the Levi subgroup of $\boldsymbol{P}$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{P}'$). Let X be an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-submodule of $I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q})$. By Lemma 4.23 and Lemma 4.24, $\operatorname{supp} X = n_w(\Lambda^+_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}(1))$ for $w \in W$ such that $\Delta_w \cap \Delta(\sigma) = \Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}$. Hence

$$\{n_w(\Lambda^+_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}}}(1)) \mid \Delta_w \cap \Delta(\sigma) = \Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}\} = \{n_w(\Lambda^+_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}'}}(1)) \mid \Delta_w \cap \Delta(\sigma') = \Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}\}.$$

Notice that $w\Lambda^+_\Theta(1) = w'\Lambda^+_{\Theta'}(1)$ implies $\Theta = \Theta'$ and $w \in w'W_{\Theta'}$. Hence $\Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \Delta_{\boldsymbol{M}'}$. Therefore $\boldsymbol{P} = \boldsymbol{P}'$. If $w \in W$ satisfies $\Delta_w \cap \Delta(\sigma) = \Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}$, then $\Delta_w \supset \Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}} \supset \Delta_{\boldsymbol{P}}$. Hence $w(\Delta_{\boldsymbol{P}}) \subset \Sigma^+$. Namely $w \in W^{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Therefore, if $w, w' \in W$ satisfies $\Delta_w \cap \Delta(\sigma) = \Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}$, $\Delta_{w'} \cap \Delta(\sigma') = \Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}$ and $w \in w'W_{\boldsymbol{M}}$, then $w = w'$. Hence

$$\{w \mid \Delta_w \cap \Delta(\sigma) = \Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}\} = \{w \mid \Delta_w \cap \Delta(\sigma') = \Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}'}\}.$$

Therefore $\Delta(\sigma) = \Delta(\sigma')$ and $\boldsymbol{Q} = \boldsymbol{Q}'$.

We have $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}} \sigma \subset I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q})$. Take $\lambda \in \Lambda(1)$ as in Lemma 4.25. Then the subspace $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}} \sigma \subset I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q})$ is characterized by $\{x \in I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q}) \mid xE(\lambda) \neq 0\}$. Hence an isomorphism $I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q}) \to I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma', \boldsymbol{Q}')$ gives a morphism $w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}} \sigma \to$

$w_\Delta w_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{Q}}}\sigma'$. By Proposition 4.14, we have a non-zero homomorphism $\sigma \to \sigma'$ as $\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}$-modules. By Remark 4.7, σ and σ' are irreducible $\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}$-modules. Hence $\sigma \simeq \sigma'$ as $\mathcal{H}^-_{\boldsymbol{M}}$-modules and by Remark 4.7 again, $\sigma \simeq \sigma'$ as $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$-modules.

Finally we introduce the notion of supercuspidality and compare it with supersingularlity.

Definition 4.30. An irreducible representation π of $\mathcal{H}$ is called *supercuspidal* if it is not isomorphic to a subquotient of $I_{\boldsymbol{P}}(\sigma)$ where $\boldsymbol{P} = \boldsymbol{MN}$ is a proper parabolic subgroup of $\boldsymbol{G}$ and σ an irreducible representation of $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$.

Corollary 4.31. *Let $\pi = I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q})$ is an irreducible representation of $\mathcal{H}$. Then the following is equivalent.*

(1) *π is supersingular.*
(2) *π is supercuspidal.*
(3) *$\boldsymbol{P} = \boldsymbol{G}$.*

Proof. Obviously (3) implies (1). Since $I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q})$ is the subquotient of $I_{\boldsymbol{P}}(\sigma)$, (2) implies (3). Assume that π is not supercuspidal. Take $(\boldsymbol{P}', \sigma')$ such that π is a subquotient of $I_{\boldsymbol{P}'}(\sigma')$ and $\boldsymbol{P}'$ is minimal subject to this condition. Then σ' is supercuspidal. We have already proved that irreducible supercuspidal representations are supersingular. Hence σ' is supersingular. By Corollary 4.26, it is of a form $I(\boldsymbol{P}', \sigma', \boldsymbol{Q}')$ for some $\boldsymbol{Q}'$. Hence $\boldsymbol{P} = \boldsymbol{P}' \neq \boldsymbol{G}$. Let $X \subset I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q})$ be an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-submodule. By Lemma 4.23, $X \subset w\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ for some $w \in W$ and by 4.24, we have $\operatorname{supp} X = n_w(\Lambda_{\Delta_{\boldsymbol{P}}}(1))$. Hence by Lemma 4.21 (3), $I(\boldsymbol{P}, \sigma, \boldsymbol{Q})$ is not supersingular. □

References

[Abe13] N. Abe, *On a classification of irreducible admissible modulo p representations of a p-adic split reductive group*, Compos. Math. **149** (2013), no. 12, 2139–2168.

[AHHV14] N. Abe, G. Henniart, F. Herzig, and M.-F. Vigneras, *A classification of irreducible admissible mod p representations of p-adic reductive groups*, arXiv:1412.0737.

[BL95] L. Barthel and R. Livné, *Modular representations of* GL_2 *of a local field: the ordinary, unramified case*, J. Number Theory **55** (1995), no. 1, 1–27.

[GK] E. Große-Klönne, *From pro-p Iwahori-Hecke modules to (ϕ, Γ)-modules I*, preprint.

[IM65] N. Iwahori and H. Matsumoto, *On some Bruhat decomposition and the structure of the Hecke rings of p-adic Chevalley groups*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1965), no. 25, 5–48.

[Oll10] R. Ollivier, *Parabolic induction and Hecke modules in characteristic p for p-adic* GL_n, Algebra Number Theory **4** (2010), no. 6, 701–742.

[Oll12] R. Ollivier, *Compatibility between Satake and Bernstein-type isomorphisms in characteristic p*, to appear in Algebra Number Theory.

[Tit66] J. Tits, *Normalisateurs de tores. I. Groupes de Coxeter étendus*, J. Algebra **4** (1966), 96–116.

[Viga] M.-F. Vignéras, *The pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra of a p-adic group I*, to appear in Compositio mathematica.

[Vigb] M.-F. Vignéras, *The pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra of a p-adic group III*, to appear in Journal of the Institute of Mathematics of Jussieu.

[Vig05] M.-F. Vignéras, *Pro-p-Iwahori Hecke ring and supersingular* $\overline{\mathbf{F}}_p$*-representations*, Math. Ann. **331** (2005), no. 3, 523–556.

[Vig14] M.-F. Vignéras, *The pro-p-Iwahori Hecke algebra of a p-adic group II*, Muenster J. of Math. **7** (2014), no. 1, 364–379.

Creative Research Institution (CRIS), Hokkaido University, N21, W10, Kita-ku, Sapporo, Hokkaido 001-0021, Japan

E-mail address: abenori@math.sci.hokudai.ac.jp